THE
NEW YORK REVIEW

VOL. III JULY-AUGUST, 1907 NO. 1

CATHOLIC IDEAS AND TENDENCIES IN MODERN RUSSIAN THOUGHT

Aurelio Palmieri, O. S. A.

The laws relative to liberty of conscience promulgated in Russia in 1905 have laid open a vast field of action for Roman Catholicism in the great Empire. For more than a century Russian politics strenuously supported by the half lay half clerical bureaucracy of the Synod of St. Petersburg, had labored with much constancy of purpose to break down or weaken the influence of the Catholic Church on the Russian frontiers. Its efforts were especially directed towards the annihilation of the uniats of Poland and of Russia Minor, who, after the lamentable defection of Joseph Siemachko (1868) created metropolitan of Lithuania in 1839, had been officially inscribed as members of the Orthodox Church.[1] Constantine Pobiedonostzev the Ober-Procuror of the Synod of St. Petersburg who for twenty-five years had made the Russian Orthodox church the slave of his political despotism, now revived the methods of Nero in his persecution of Catholicism. The former ex-uniats were especially the victims of his political schemes and many of them were sent to prison or exiled to Siberia, and some even were put to death because of their unwavering attachment to the Roman See. Thirty thousand of them refused with unflinching constancy to accept the spiritual ministrations of the Orthodox *popes* whom the Synod had installed in their parishes by the aid of armed cossacks; and as the Catholic priests could not attend to their spiritual needs under pain of being exiled to Siberia, the

[1] *Orthodox Theological Encyclopedia.* St. Petersburg, 1906, vol. vii, col. 476

unfortunate but steadfast confessors of the faith were forced to die without the sacraments, the children were not baptized and marriages were not blessed.

Yet all the efforts of Pobiedonostzev, whom the faithful in Russia consider as the Nero of the nineteenth century, came to naught, for no sooner had liberty of conscience been proclaimed in the country than the former uniats who had against their will been enrolled in the Orthodox church, returned *en masse* to Catholicism. According to the official statistics of the *Tzerkovnyia Viedomosti*, the organ of the Synod of St. Petersburg, in the diocese of Chelm during the year 1905, the conversions of the Orthodox to Catholicism numbered 110000; in the diocese of Vilna, 30000; in that of Minsk, 10000, and 10000 in the diocese of Grodno.[2] It may here be observed that these figures in reality represent only about one-half of the conversions. In 1905 more than 30000 ex-uniats and orthodox embraced Catholicism[3] and, what is a rare occurrence in Russia, four orthodox priests of whom one was a monk, passed over to the Latin rite. Nor does this movement towards Rome seem to be on the decline. If the government were to remove the barriers that keep out the Catholic clergy from other countries, it is not unlikely that in some measure at least, would be verified the prophecy of the Slavic theologian Khomiakov, who once said: If liberty of conscience were promulgated in Russia the cultured classes would pass over to Catholicism, while the lower classes would join the numerous sects which, holding fast to the traditions of the past, are energetically opposed to the Official Russian Church.

Indeed Catholicism seems destined to achieve in the course of time great conquests in Russia. The Slavic mind is by natural temperament inclined to mysticism, and it is a well known fact that the Orthodox Church of to-day with its bureaucratical organization and its servility towards a regime which the Russian people detest—and not without reason—is in no condition to satisfy this tendency. It is a matter of historical experience that the evolution of religious and social movements is not accomplished in a day nor even in a century; nevertheless there are at present to be perceived in Russia signs of a doctrinal orientation towards Catholicism, of an aspiration

[2] *Problems of the Orthodox Church in Western and Southern Russia, Tzerkovnyia Viedomosti*, 1906, n. 25, p. 2007.

[3] *Die Katholische Kirche in Russland einst und jetzt. Historisch-politische Blætter*, 1906, vol. 36, p. 397.

towards a religious system, which once free from the fetters of a bureaucratical organization may through its union with Western Catholicism form a universal church. These symptoms are discernible in Russian religious literature of the present day, and it cannot be otherwise than interesting to set them forth at some length, for they may prove to be only the prelude to a great religious and social upheaval which is already preparing in the realm of the Tsars.[4]

* * *

In the first place, an *indirect* doctrinal orientation towards the Roman Church is at present noticeable in Russia. To understand this phase of religious thought in that country, it is necessary to cast a glance at the condition of the Russian Orthodox clergy. According to the statistics of 1906 the Russian hierarchy comprises 133 bishops, of whom 18 are on the retired list because of age or sickness. The number of bishops in active service therefore is 115, and of these 63 are in Russia proper, and four in Georgia; the others are vicars who by their attributions and duties correspond to our coadjutor bishops. There are in Russia three Metropolitan sees, those of St. Petersburg, Moscow and Kiev, and several Archiepiscopal sees, viz., Vladivostok, Vladimir, Odessa, Riga, etc.[5] The lower clergy numbers 4487 priests, of whom 2340 are *protoierei* or archpriests; 14960 deacons, and 43552 chanters (*psalomchtchiki*).[6] The bishops by a law which is not common to the other orthodox churches are monks, the total number of which is over 15000, dispersed in 500 monasteries. The clergy is thus divided into two quite distinct classes—the monasterial and the so-called "white" or parochial clergy. Those of the former class observe ostensibly the law of celibacy;[7] those of the second are allowed to marry. Ordinarily the "popes" before receiving priest's orders are required to take a wife. The monasteries are the nurseries of the episcopate because the bishops being bound to the

[4] *Die Katholische Kirche im Russland. Pastor Bonus*, Trier, 1905, p. 569-574.

[5] *Ecclesiastical and Social Life*, Kazan, 1906. n. 22, col. 770.

[6] *Kolokol*, St. Petersburg, Jan. 1, 1906.

[7] We say "ostensibly" because as a fact, the majority of the Russian monks have their *cernitze* or concubines. The most flourishing monasteries are surrounded by houses occupied by these concubines and their children. This license is so well known to the public that not even the clerical press makes any attempt to hide or deny the immoral conduct of the monks. Each of the latter receives a yearly stipend of from 500 to 1000 rubles, according to the wealth of the monastery, a circumstance which contributes to render these "religious" more vicious than they would otherwise be. Cf. *The Causes of the Moral Decadence of Monastic Life*, 1906, n. 44.

law of celibacy are chosen from the monks. The priests of the parochial clergy, should they happen to become widowers, may aspire to episcopal honors, but to attain thereto, they must first embrace the monastic life. From this arrangement results a strange paradox, viz. that the monks who are supposed to have withdrawn from the world in order to live in humility and seclusion, really form an ambitious class which wields the supreme power in the church, shares the absolutism of the civil government and possesses great wealth; while the parochial clergy, though having to bear all the burden of the priestly office, have no voice in the direction of church affairs and are often exposed to suffer the direst want and misery. Thus in the Russian church we find a democratic element consisting of the lower clergy and an aristocratic element, viz. the clergy of the monasteries.

With the diffusion of liberal ideas the social and economic disparity between these two classes of the clergy who, as regards their tendencies and interests are so opposed to each other, has become more and more striking and it has brought about a schism which though still latent, may soon be openly declared. The "white" clergy in its struggles against the episcopate, has espoused the cause of democracy, and that all the more readily as democratic principles form the doctrinal substratum of the constitution of the Orthodox Churches. According to Khomiakov, whose church theories are at present greatly in vogue among the ranks of the lower clergy, especially the progressive ones, the Roman Church derives its constitution from the spirit of absolutism and centralization, prevalent in the Roman Empire, while the Eastern branch, to which Russian Christianity traces its origin and development through Byzantium, never sacrificed to authority the just exigencies of religious individualism.[8] A favorite principle with this writer is the following: *The Church recognizes only brotherhood and repudiates all class distinctions.*[9] To his mind, Protestantism is a rationalistic form of idealism; Catholicism is a rationalistic form of materialism, while the Orthodox Church represents liberty in unity, life in reason according to the law of love.[10] Love in the theological system of Khomiakov takes the place of the hierarchy. The church is one in the union of all believers freely

[8] *History of Recent Russian Literature*, St. Petersburg, 1906, p. 36.

[9] *The Fundamental Principles of the Conciliary Regime. Tzerkovnyi Golos.* St. Petersburg, 1906. n. 7-8.

[10] *Zavitnevitch*, Alexis Stepanovitch Khomiakov. Kiev, 1902. vol. ii, p. 1275.

united in the spirit of Christian brotherhood, and participating in the same graces of the Holy Ghost.[11]

True Orthodoxy according to this Russian theologian avoids on the one hand the absolutism of the Catholic theocracy, and on the other, the inherent disintegrating elements of Protestantism with its consequent division into countless sects. Orthodoxy, while admitting the hierarchical principle, refuses nevertheless, to recognize the hierarchy as a juridical institution in the church, i. e., as the basis of a lawful superiority of bishops over priests.

These theories have been amply discussed by the theologians of the lower clergy in the sessions of a Commission, which, on the suggestion of the Synod of St. Petersburg, undertook to prepare for the convocation of a Russian National Council. Ever since 1714 the Russian Church has been ruled by the lay patriarchs of the Synod, and now there is a movement, powerfully seconded by the lower clergy, in the direction of a radical reform of the constitution, the re-establishment of the patriarchate and the suppression of the lay bureaucracy. In the discussions which took place in the Commission the partisans or representatives of the "white" clergy vigorously maintained that the church is not a hierarchical, or episcopal organization.[12] According to Zaozersky, a very learned canonist of the ecclesiastical Academy of Moscow, the distinction between pastor and flock does not exist in reality. The distinction between the *ecclesia docens* and the *ecclesia discens* has no sanction in the Christian dispensation.[13] "The Gospel proclaims that all are equal," writes the Archpriest Rojdestvensky, professor in the Ecclesiastical Faculty of St. Petersburg. The Orthodox Church rejects the infallibility of the Pope, and a fortiori it cannot accept the infallibility of the Episcopate. The acknowledgement of the supremacy of bishops over priests does not differ from the acceptance of papal absolutism.[14] The bishops can do nothing without the Church, and consequently they are not invested with an authority which raises them above the others."[15] In the *Tzerkovnyi Golos*, a periodical which is the organ of the lower clergy, we read that the idea of a primacy is foreign to the true notion of the Church; the bishops merely represent in

[11] *Ibid.* p. 1402-1404.
[12] *Tzerkovnyia Viedomosti*, 1906, n. 18, p. 1064.
[13] *Ibid.* n. 23, p. 1649.
[14] *Ibid.* p. 1653.
[15] *Ibid.* n. 16, p. 843.

the church a more exalted symbolism, but their rights in the government of the Church are no greater than those of the priests and laymen.[16] Such are the radical theories which have been defended by the official organs of the four Russian theological universities, St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev and Kazan.

As might be expected, the hierarchy and the monasteries rose in alarm against these democratic tendencies on the part of the lower clergy. The bishops in their public documents speak of the dangerous tendencies of modern Russian society, which no longer has confidence in the bishops, and of the consequent danger for the Church,[17] and Prof. Golnbev, of Kiev, unhesitatingly declares that the Russian clergy is becoming infected with Protestant ideas.[18] Antonius, Archbishop of Volinia, who has become the head of those who are striving to maintain the rights and prerogatives of the monks and the monopoly of the episcopate by the same, thus describes the deep chasm that has been opened between the two sections of the clergy:

"In the Russian Church there are at present two tendencies, one administrative and the other popular. The former is based on the Latin traditions and those of the medieval schools, and its ideals are religious; the latter places its religious ideals in the observation of feasts and fasts, and in the carrying out of the external ritual of the Church." "The reform party," he continues. "would lead Russia into religious nihilism. The Theological Academy of Moscow openly teaches Protestantism; the spiritual fathers are preaching the suppression of the episcopate; the ecclesiastical schools recommend the laicization of everything, and all within the church are clamoring for equal privileges. . . .The clerical press is replete with ideas copied from Protestant sources."[19] What are the means of combating these internal enemies of the Orthodox Church? Bishop Antonius, although a strong adversary of Catholicism, propounds a theory which is contrary to the fundamental maxims of Orthodox theology. This, in fact, maintains that all the bishops are equal; that there is no head in the Church other than the invisible head, Christ; and thus the Roman supremacy is in direct contradiction to the democratic constitution of the Church. Instead of this, the Archbishop of Volinia ascribes all the evils and dangers that beset

[16] *Ibid.* n. 2, 1906, p. 34, n. 3, p. 67.
[17] *Ibid.* 1906, n. 21, p. 1318.
[18] *Ibid.* p. 1312.
[19] *Tzerkonov-Obclitch jizn*, 1906, n. 6, col. 205.

the Russian Orthodox Church to the fact that it is deprived of an advantage enjoyed by the Latin branch of Christianity, viz. a legitimate head, while it is plundered by a bureaucracy composed of laymen. The Russian Church, he says, is founded on a violation of the canons. Christian Orthodoxy never recognized national churches deprived of their legitimate heads.[20] He maintains that the general council, in which is vested the supreme legislative authority of the Orthodox religion, cannot be convoked unless there be a Patriarch having the power to do so. The Russian Church cannot exist without a spiritual sovereign, without a patriarch who, representing and personifying Jesus Christ, will constitute a bond of union between Christians.[21] He deplores the fact that in the Russian Church there does indeed exist a spiritual sovereign wielding a far greater power than that accorded to any patriarch, but this spiritual head is merely a layman.[22]

In fact, the Russian bishops who are the most esteemed for their learning and purity of doctrine, give expression to the same ideas. In trying to oppose the semi-Protestant movement which is stirring the ranks of the inferior clergy, the Russian hierarchy seems to lose sight of the fundamental canons of the Orthodox Church, and takes to maintaining the monarchical character and constitution of the Church of Jesus. In the episcopate all are not equal. One bishop should be above all the others. To him it belongs to represent the Church before God, before the civil power and the people. And this bishop has the right to judge his brethren in the episcopate.

Strange to say, several of the most noted and esteemed professors of the Russian theological faculties have explicitly recognized the existence of a primacy of jurisdiction in the Church, and they invoke in favor of their thesis those very texts to which Catholic theologians appeal in demonstrating the prerogatives of the Roman pontiff. Prof. Nicholas Glubokovsky, one of the greatest Russian exegetical scholars, made the following statement in one of the sessions of the Commission preparatory to the Council: "We do not believe in the primacy as understood in the Roman confession; yet we read in the Gospel that among the twelve Apostles, Simon, called Peter, was first: πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος. These words are not devoid of meaning, since to Peter was granted the great privilege of confirming his

[20] *Ibid.* col. 206.
[21] *Ibid.* col. 208.
[22] *Ibid.* col. 209.

brethren in the faith in the most difficult and critical moments in the historical life of the Church. Wherefore, I see no reason for repudiating the notion of a primacy which is justified by the authority of Holy Writ, and which is postulated by the normal constitution of the Church."[23] These are precisely the chief reasons brought forward by Catholic theologians to demonstrate the necessity of a supreme legislative and judicial authority in the Church of Christ.

Glubokovsky, however, did not dare push his arguments to their ultimate logical conclusions, and admit that the texts so appositely quoted refer plainly to Peter and his successors. But other able ecclesiastical writers, whose views may be looked upon as independent and impartial, have set aside all reticence, declaring that the primacy in the Church belongs to no other than to Peter and his successors in the See of Rome. We may quote especially in this connection the historian of the Byzantine Church, Alexis Lebedev, professor of Church history in the University of Moscow, who has devoted a chapter of one of his recent works to prove that in the Apostolic Age and in the first three centuries of Christianity the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff is a fact resting on such a mass of evidence that it cannot be reasonably called in question.[24] And if the primitive church renders such clear testimony to the divine institution of this primacy, the Orthodox Church in repudiating it assumes a position contrary to Christian tradition and to the Gospel.

On the other hand, the religious press recognizes the immense power and advantage that Catholicism derives from the institution of the papacy. To the point is the following extract from the *Tzerkovnyi Viestnik*, an organ of the lower clergy, edited by the professors of the theological faculty of St. Petersburg: "If we had the papacy with its theory of the mutual relations between the civil and ecclesiastical power, things would go differently. The life of the Russian Church would take on that character which we observe among the Catholics of the West. In Catholicism the Pope is the personification of a principle; he concentrates in himself all the tendencies and all the aspirations of Catholic life. This principle which is fully independent, impresses its characteristics upon all that comes in contact with it. The Catholic clergy is an army which is sent into all parts of the world by its chief residing in Rome, in order to bring about the triumph of the papal views and policies. This army never fuses

[23] *Terzkovnyia Viedomosti*, 1906, n, 22, p. 1516.

[24] *The Clergy in the Ancient Universal Church*, Moscow, 1906, part ii, chap. 7.

with the varied mass of the surrounding people, but everywhere and always combats for the same ideals. We have nothing of the kind in our church, which is in reality nothing but a cogwheel in the machine of the state."[25] And comparing in another passage the Catholic clergy with the clergy of the Orthodox Church, the same periodical is forced to admit the vast superiority of the former. "Among Catholics the people take a lively interest in the feasts of the Church; with us there is nothing but a supreme indifference. Observe the Catholic religious processions. How orderly they are and how marked by pious demeanor. What confusion and disorder, on the other hand, do we not behold in the processions of the Orthodox? We are obliged to recognize and admire the force of cohesion, and the unity of action and the zeal of the Roman Catholic clergy."[26] To these testimonies might be added others which go to show that the most cultured members of the Orthodox clergy have to-day a very different idea of Catholicism from the one entertained by their grandparents; they no longer hurl at it the anathemas formulated by an undivided byzantine hierarchy. It is even admitted—a thing unheard of in the past—that on certain doctrinal points of difference the Catholics may be right. The *Filioque* clause for instance, used to be considered a few years back as the most monstrous heresy that had ever appeared, and so the Greek theologians regard it even now. But with the Russians it is different. Kireev, a theologian imbued with the ideas of the "Old Catholics," publishes in the *Bogolsovsky Vristrik* the most esteemed periodical of the Russian Church, an article in which is shown that from the viewpoint of theological reasoning the Latin Church is in the right; that the controversy concerning the *Filioque* need not be an obstacle to the reunion of the Churches; that the Latins may teach it freely as a theological opinion derived from the speculations of Origen, St. Augustine and St. Fulgentius. And the same views are shared by the most famous Russian liturgist of modern times, the archpriest Alexis Maltzev, who maintains in his works that an agreement between the two churches is possible, and that the only obstacle is the dogma of papal infallibility. According to this writer, the supremacy of the Roman pontiffs is a doctrine which cannot be gainsaid; the other disputed dogmas are not of a nature to interfere with the reunion of Christendom; and the Vatican Council is responsible for having erected a wall of division between the two churches. Thus it appears that we

[25] *Tzerkovnyi Viestnik*, 1904, n. 47, col. 1482.
[26] *Ibid.* n. 43, col. 1400-1401.

are far removed from the time when the Orthodox theologians, according to a curious document published by Combefis, anathematized ninety heresies of the Latin Church. There are, it is true, some fanatics among the monks who continue to combat Catholicism on the lines of the old Byzantine polemics. At the "Laurel," a monastery of Pociaev, are published tracts and leaflets containing the most odious calumnies against the Catholic Church. Also the bishop of Vitebsk, in order to check the movement towards Catholicism on the part of the ex-Uniats, published in 1906 a pamphlet in which it was asserted that Catholics by paying 50 rubles to their confessor, may receive permission to commit parricide, or incest, or to perpetrate the most outrageous crimes. But even the accredited organs of the Orthodox clergy took up the defence of Catholicism against these calumnies, accusing the monks of Pociaev of falsifying in a most cynical manner the faith and practice of their brethren.[27]

The popular movement which has created so much disturbance in Russia, has brought about in the lower clergy an awakening of conscience together with aspirations towards liberty. All the clerical organs, even the most reactionary (for instance, the *Missionerskoe Obozrienie* or Missionary Review of St. Petersburg), speak unceasingly of the slavery of the Russian Church, of the despotism of the "Procurators" of the Holy Synod who, though at times atheists, nevertheless rule the Church according to their ideas; and of the police functions imposed by the government on the bishops and priests. Furthermore, comparing the servile condition of the Russian Church with the ever renewed energy displayed by Catholicism, these writers recognize that the superiority of the latter is due to its organization under the papacy; and for that reason an effort is being made to copy certain of its characteristics which formerly provoked the anger of the Orthodox writers. In this connection may be mentioned a recent article in the *Strannik* (the Traveller), a widely read clerical periodical, in which the Roman congregation of the Index was praised and the wish was expressed that a similar tribunal might be instituted in Russia in order to preserve the unity of faith.[28]

It would, of course, be premature to infer from these Catholic tendencies any ultra optimistic conclusions, for instance, that we are on the eve of seeing religious peace established between the East and the West, for the Russian Church officially considered is ever the

[27] *Tzerkovnyi Viestnik*, 1906, n. 39, col. 1294.
[28] Vol. i, (1906) p. 630-634.

enemy of Rome, but it cannot be denied that there is going on within that body a remarkable change of ideas with regard to Catholicism. Its polemical attitude has lost much of its former bitterness. The Pope is no longer characterized as Anti-Christ or a personification of Satan, and the monarchical constitution of the Church is lauded and held to be an indispensable element in her conservation and success.

* * *

A more striking tendency in the direction of Catholicism, is noticeable among the higher or aristocratic classes of society. Those who, according to the Russian expression, form the "intelligence" of the country, entertain an undisguised contempt for the hierarchy as well as for the inferior clergy. Their quarrel with the former refers to its political slavery, and its aversion to all measures tending towards a reform of civil and political conditions--in a word, its chronic policy of putting religion and the Gospel at the service of the State. It is well known that before Alexander II (the Liberator) decreed the abolition of slavery in his dominions, the Russian bishops were wont to prove from texts of the Gospel that the Church recognized the moral and social advantages of slavery, and that the tortures not unfrequently inflicted on the unfortunate Mujiks or peasants by brutal masters, were good for the purification of their souls. Then, the inferior clergy, as is shown by Prof. Znamensky in a series of excellent articles on the parochial clergy from the time of Peter the Great down to the present time[29] is the victim of traditions which have always kept the popes at the bottom round of the social ladder and in a moral condition inferior to that of the Mujiks. Indeed, from ancient times the Russian nobility has always looked upon the clergy as domestic servants, and in the Muscovite provinces the nobles have been known to oblige their peasants to receive priest's orders in order to reap the sordid gains connected with that office. The clergy thus despised on account of its degraded condition, has ever remained densely ignorant, surrounded by wretched poverty and contaminated by the vices that naturally follow such conditions, particularly drunkeness, unchastity and miserly avarice. Even the most reactionary of the Russian clerical periodicals admit that the majority of the popes are victims of alcoholism,[30] and that they are

[29] *Prikhodskœ Dukhovenstvo v Rossii sovremeni reformy Petra, Pravoslavnyi Sobesiednik*, 1872.

[30] *Missionerskoe Obozrienie*, St. Petersburg, 1905, n, 1, p. 17.

far below the intellectual and moral level of the Catholic or Protestant clergy. Whence follows that a Russian of rank or of moderate culture would consider it beneath his dignity to associate with members of the inferior clergy, so degraded has their office become in public esteem. Furthermore, the Rússians of the more cultured classes often travel in Catholic countries, and cannot help remarking the superiority of the clergy there over their own ignorant and bibulous popes, as also the wonderful activity of the Catholic Church in all the complex phases of social life and charitable endeavor. In their own church, which, to use the words of Dostaievsky, was long since stricken with paralysis, they behold nothing but a corpse covered indeed with brilliant decorations, but deprived of life and movement. Even the Russian bishops confess that their church is dead, and the pessimistic views of the laity are naturally still worse than those of the churchmen. The press is unanimous in recognizing that the clergy is without any influence on society and that between pastor and flock there is no longer any bond of union. The tendency towards Catholicism on the part of the better classes has its cause in the decay of the Apostolic spirit among the clergy, and the inability of the latter to rise to the intellectual and moral level of cultured society. It is only natural that these tendencies should manifest themselves more particularly among the ladies of rank, who in Russia receive an education not surpassed or perhaps even equalled in other countries. Many of these aristocratic ladies are either Catholics in disguise or at least imbued with Catholicism. This spread of Catholic ideas among the female portion of Russian society is due in a great measure to the activity of a lady of noble birth, one whose name hitherto veiled by anonymity deserves to be known and honored now that she has passed to her reward, for she was indeed a heroine of the Catholic cause in Russia.

In 1888 there was published in Berlin a beautiful volume in Russian entitled *The Church, an Historical Essay.*[31] With profound erudition the anonymous author passed in review the most important facts of the history of primitive Christianity, and demonstrated by the testimony of the early fathers the doctrine of the supremacy of the Roman pontiffs, together with the necessity of an infallible authority in the Church. The doctrine and logic of this solid volume immediately caused consternation among the professors of the Russian universities,

[31] *O Tzerkvi: istoritcheskii ocerk*, Berlin, 1888.

and two able theologians, Bjeliæv[32] and Katansky, set themselves to the task of refuting it. Their published answers resulted in eliciting a second volume from the pen of the anonymous writer, on the *Theological Literature of the Orthodox Church.*[33] In this work the objections of the two theologians were dealt with in so clear a manner and with such a richness of proof that the book remained unanswered. These two volumes were attributed to some Jesuit theologian and no one suspected that they were from the pen of a lady, supposed to be of the Orthodox creed, viz. the Princess Elizabeth Grigorievna Volkonsky, who died February 15th, (28th) 1879. Her writings did much to dissipate the prejudices against Catholicism, so common throughout Russia, and to draw a great many souls nearer to Rome.

A similar praise is likewise due to another Russian, Michael Dmitrievitch Terebtzov, (1825-1905), who under the pseudonyms "Basil Livanmski" and "Astakov," published two remarkable volumes, one on the procession of the Holy Ghost, and the other on the doctrinal crisis in the Russian Church. Terebtzov, who was the Court Chamberlain under Nicholas I, Alexander II and Alexander III, belonged to the Russian nobility, and his writings which reveal a deep theological learning, exercised a direct influence on the Catholic tendencies in the higher circles of Russian society.

The credit, however, for having created Catholic currents of thought in modern Russia is chiefly due to Vladimir Solovev, the great Russian philosopher who died in 1900, while in the full vigor of a glorious career. He was unquestionably one of the greatest mystics that Russia ever produced, and one of the deepest thinkers of modern times. His natural temper of mind as well as the trend of his philosophical and theological training led him to take a deep interest in religious questions, and each successive step forward in his theological researches brought him nearer and nearer to Rome. He pointed out that the radical weakness of the Orthodox position lay in its conception of the Church. According to the definition of Orthodox theology the Church is the congregation of the faithful united in Christ, its invisible head. The constitution of the Church, according to Orthodox canon law, is essentially democratic, and it is on this ground that it rejects so vigorously the doctrine of papal supremacy. Solovev openly advocates the monarchical principle in the Church. "One man," he writes, "who with the assistance of the Holy Ghost

[32] *O Katolitzizmie.* Kazan, 1888.

[33] *Bogoslovskia pravoslavnaia literatura,* Freiburg im Breisgau, 1892.

is the responsible head of all, such according to the Gospel is the constitutional basis of the universal Church. Her stability cannot be made dependent on the impossible unanimity of all believers nor on the doubtful and precarious agreement of the bishops assembled in council, but on the real and living unity of the prince of the Apostles."[34] One of the reasons alleged by Solovev in support of his contention is the impossibility on the part of the Orthodox Church ever since her separation from the West to convoke a single ecumenical council.[35] The Gospel texts relative to the supremacy of Peter are explained by the same author in the Catholic sense, viz. that Christ placed at the head of the hierarchy a unique central institution absolutely indivisible and independent and to which He confided the fulness of power and of the divine promises.[36] The fundamental thesis of Solovev is as follows: "The universal Church is founded on the truth affirmed by our faith. Since truth is one the true faith must also be one. And since the unity of faith does not reside really and directly in the whole body of the faithful, it must be sought in the lawful authority residing in one head—authority having the guarantee of divine assistance and thus received with love and confidence by all the faithful.[37]

The Catholic cause in Russia has had no defende more earnest than Solovev and none who wrote with greater authority. This is apparent throughout his writings on religious questions which comprise four volumes (Edition of St. Petersburg), and also from the diatribes directed against him by the Russian clerical press, especially by the *Mo kovskyia Viedomosti* and the *Viera i Razum* of Cracow, which accused him of scandalizing the good faithful Orthodox with his popish tendencies. His works have exerted a powerful influence on the youth of the country and also on the Russian clergy, and thanks to the apostolate of union of which he was the most valiant champion, the theories of the Panslavists who make the greatness of Russia and her hopes for the future dependent on hostility to the West, have been well nigh forgotten, while to many it appears that union with Rome is the only means of restoring to the Russian Church its lost prestige. Naturally the reunion would not be an absorption on the part of Rome of Oriental Christianity; it would not be a latinization

[34] *La Russie et l' Eglise universelle*, Paris, 1889, p. 93.
[35] *Ibid.* p. 95.
[36] *Ibid.* p. 100.
[37] *Ibid.* p. 120.

of the Orient; it would be simply a return to the condition of the Christian world prior to the schism of Photius and Cærularius—the supremacy of the Roman pontiffs harmonized with the proper autonomy of the particular churches. Thus Russia would fulfil her religious mission—the mission of a third Rome, which after centuries of struggle and conflict, would have brought together in fraternal unity the old Rome of the Latin world and the New Rome of Byzantium.

The monarchical idea of the Church which was historically realized in Rome, finds expression in the works of many of the modern Russian writers who have come under the influence of Solovev. Chief among these may be mentioned the Prince Sergius Trubetzkoi († 1905), who along with his master occupies a conspicuous place in the history of Russian spiritual philosophy, and the distinguished philosopher and man of letters, B. Rozanov. The latter is in Russia, one of the most popular representatives of non-dogmatic Christianity, i. e. of a religion founded upon the Gospel but which rejects all Christian dogmas as not only useless for the moral life of humanity, but also as a perpetual source of controversy and division. This theological movement had in Russia a special organ, the *Novyi Put* (the *New Life*), which at present has ceased to appear, and has been replaced by another periodical called *Voprosy Gizni* (*Questions of Lief*), which engages in frequent controversy with the most distinguished theologians of the Orthodox Church.[38] Rozanov more than once turned his attention towards Catholicism, and on account of the originality of his style as well as of his ideas, his writings provoked not a little discussion throughout the empire. In agreement with Solovev he maintains that the weakness of the Orthodox Church lies in its lack of religious unity, whereas the strength of Catholicism is due to the universal supremacy of the Pope:

> The Pope, he writes, is in truth the universal pastor. Being a Russian and Orthodox I must reject the papacy, but I cannot reject sound logic, and logically the Pope is the foundation stone upon which is constructed the edifice of the Church. The papacy is what maintains unity, and without it we are given up to sterile discussions.[39] Who says church says authority. It may be that in the beginning the life of the Church was love, but now we conceive of the Church as an authority....This authority was concêntrated in the hands of Peter upon whom as upon Elisha fell the mantle of the Master. The words of the Gospel *Pasce*

[38]Stepano. *Oznacenii dogmaticeskaja elementa v Khristianskom ucenii protiv sovremennago adogmatisma*, Kiev, 1907, p. 63-67.

[39]*Okolo tzerkovnykh stien*, St. Petersburg, 1906, vol. i, 117

oves meas, pasce agnos meos were addressed personally and exclusively to Peter, and thus the Savior intended to exclude from His Church all idea of collectivism.[40] The Greek schism was the outcome of envy on the part of Byzantium and in consequence the Russians are taught to look upon Catholics as so many heathens. Philaretus, a patriarch of Moscow, went so far as to rebaptize Catholics and the patriarch of Constantinople in combating the supremacy of the Popes usurped for himself with arrogant inconsistency the title of Judge universal and heir to the prerogatives of God.[41]

What makes the deepest impression on Rozanov is the universality of the Catholic Church. He relates that in visiting St. Peter's he remained unmoved in presence of the architectural magnificence and the artistic masterpieces of the great basilica, but when he came to the row of confessionals and read thereon *Pro Illyrica Lingua, Pro Germanica Lingua, Pro Hungarica Lingua, Pro Hispanica Lingua,* etc., he was deeply moved, and admitted that these simple inscriptions opened to his mind new and vast horizons.

"The statuary," he says, "is not the work of the Popes but of the artists. On the other hand, the universality of the languages used in the apostolic ministry reveals the work of the Popes. All Catholics even from the most remote regions come hither to their common father. All know him no matter what be their language, and even though they know not how to read.[42] Peter follows in the footsteps of Christ. Like the Man-God he died on the cross, and in Rome where he was crucified, were erected the Lateran and the Vatican. The papacy, like the corollary of a theorem, rests on the three words of Christ: *Pasce oves meas.*[43] Our theologians have failed in their attempt to explain these simple words, and have tried in vain to prove that all the Apostles enjoyed the same authority, that no difference had been established between them, that the bishop of Rome has no more authority than the bishop of Kaluga (a small Russian city). Nevertheless, these same theologians admit that the bishop of Constantinople or of Moscow is above the bishop of Kaluga. Such contradictions and inconsistencies are repugnant to Russian honesty. . . . We ridicule the idea of papal infallibility and of papal supremacy, and yet Christianity has ever and always assumed the form of a pyramidal hierarchical edifice. There is always a supreme head, then intermediate pastors and finally the flock. The bishop of Kaluga is inferior to the bishop of Moscow, and the latter is inferior to the bishop of Constantinople. Peter alone unfurled his standard in the Colosseum, triumphed over the Roman Cæsars, and founded a kingdom which is not of this world.[44]

* * *

Many similar passages might be quoted from the works of Rozanov, who, while affirming his loyal adhesion to the anti-papal principles

[40] *Ibid.* p. 119.
[41] *Ibid.* p. 121.
[42] *Ibid.* pp. 283-284.
[43] *Ibid.* p. 296.
[44] *Ibid.* p. 297.

of the Russian Church, clearly demonstrates that the papacy is, and of a necessity must be, the foundation stone of the universal Church. Enough has been said to show clearly the existence of Catholic tendencies in modern Russian thought. Strange to say these tendencies are noticeable even in the manuals of canon law, a branch which heretofore seemed to have for its special and exclusive object to combat the alleged pretensions of Rome. If space permitted it would be easy to prove this assertion by analyzing the course of canon law (*Ucebnik Tzerkovnago prava, Saroslav*, 1898), of Prof. N. Suvorov, in which it would be interesting to trace the influence exercised by the author's study of the canon law of the Roman Church.

It must be allowed that these Catholic tendencies would be more vigorous and fruitful if Catholic theologians and men of science had shown a greater interest in Russia and her religion; if they had avoided that studied contempt in connection with the Orthodox Church, which in the case of some arises from a lack of knowledge as to the true state of things, and in others from a false notion of the Christian apostolate. In fact, we behold to-day in the East a rising generation of belligerent apostles, who seem to think that the best way to bring the various separated sects back to Catholic unity is to heap abuse and insult upon Oriental Christianity. These so-called apostles are more familiar with the vocabulary of vituperation than with the theology of brotherly love. It must not be inferred, however, from the existence of these Catholic tendencies in modern Russian thought that we are looking forward to a speedy conversion of the country to Catholicism Some there are who either through interested motives or through enthusiasm which causes illusion, allow themselves to believe that with a congress, together with a Greek or Slavish mass and a few other liturgical details the differences between the two churches could be settled, and the reduction to unity of the benighted multitudes of the East could immediately he proclaimed *Urbi et Orbi*. The present writer entertains no such optimistic view. We must confess with regret that the much desired reunion is still far off, and the conditions at present prevailing in Russia and in the East are not such as to make us hope for a speedy pacification of the hostile camps into which Christendom is divided. Rozanov clearly pointed out the many obstacles that stand in the way of the reconciliation on the part of the Russian clergy, of the government and of the people; and in his opinion the conversion of Russia to Catholicism is a work

that can be accomplished only through the intervention of divine providence.

The clergy with very few exceptions is very hostile to the papacy. The Eastern churches are essentially autonomous and independent, and to them union with Rome means—whatever be objected to the contrary—the loss or at least the crippling of their autonomy. The Russian clergy can never understand that a bishop in order to make legitimate use of his powers, needs to be confirmed in his office by the Pope. They can never be made to understand that in matters pertaining to canon law or in matters of conscience there be any need of having recourse to the Roman Congregations. When there is question of a bureaucratic system the Russian clergy will chose to retain its own rather than change it for one residing in Rome, even though the former be the lay bureaucracy of the Synod. Such observations I have often listened to on the part of learned Russian prelates. Union with Rome can only be effected on a footing of equality; the Pope is the primate of the universal Church but the various churches must be independent in matters pertaining to their own internal administration. A policy like the one formulated in the Council of Florence, placing the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church in subjection to that of Rome would at present be impossible, and so long as by re-union is meant the submission of the Orthodox churches to the Roman Church, as it is at present constituted, all attempts to reconcile the East with the West are bound to remain fruitless. It is a painful admission, but it is better to state the truth, howsoever unwelcome, than to indulge in empty dreams and expectations.

Another obstacle which keeps Orthodox Russia in a constant attitude of distrust in presence of the Roman Church, is, according to the Russian ecclesiastical writers, the changeableness of the Vatican policy with regard to the Slavic peoples. For instance, the *Bogoslovsky Viestnik* and the *Tzerkovnyi Viestnik* accuse Pius X of following a line of conduct totally different from that of Leo XIII. The latter, they say, loved and venerated the Oriental churches, whereas Pius X holds them in aversion. And the proof of this aversion is found, according to the same periodicals, in the severity of the Congregation of Rites with reference to the Slavic liturgy. The recent decrees limiting its use in Croatia and Dalmatia have occasioned an intense dissatisfaction among the Catholics of these two countries; in fact so great was the feeling of resentment that several bishops, fearing a schism, omitted to publish the decrees in their dioceses. The

Russian press seized upon these facts and made the most of them, claiming that they were a proof of the insincerity of Rome, that the Popes, after having promised to maintain the Oriental liturgies, had forgotten their promise as soon as they had secured their object. And to strengthen their assertion they recall the cruel persecutions that the Ruthenian uniats had to sustain on the part of the Poles and of the Latin clergy; nor do they forget to mention the annihilation of the Greek Church in Italy. For the Slavic peoples and for Oriental Christians generally the liturgical language is an essential factor of national life; so essential that the Slavs of Dalmatia and Croatia would be disposed rather to become schismatics than to give it up. Unfortunately, the Russians have become convinced that with respect to questions of liturgy Rome has never given sufficient guarantees, and they claim that if to-day there may be a Pope who loves and admires the Orient, there may be another to-morrow who, through ignorance or despotism, will trample upon the rights of the Eastern churches, and thus Rome continues to be looked upon as the eternal enemy of the Russian nation.

As regards the dogmatic difficulties, theoretically speaking, an *entente* would be possible. but grave obstacles stand in the way of its actual realization. The Oriental branches of Christendom will never accept as dogmatic truths those points which have been defined by the Latin Church against schismatics; they might perhaps accept them as theological opinions, never as dogmas of faith, since for the legitimate definition of these, according to Orthodox theology, the convocation of an ecumenical council is necessary. The dogma of papal infallibility is erroneously understood by Greeks and Russians as involving impeccability, and the Orthodox Church will have great difficulty in accepting it. An infallible Pope, according to the Greek idea, does away with the conciliary principle which was the cornerstone of the primitive church—with an infallible Pope the ecumenical council becomes a superfluous institution.

Another grave obstacle would come from the Russian government which has long since become accustomed to look upon the church as a part of the political and civil organization, and to make use of it for its own ends and interests. Union with Rome would mean the submission of the Russian Church to a foreign power, which, considering the aggressiveness of Catholicism, would soon be interfering with the internal administration of the Empire.

As regards the people, the cultured classes have already practically severed their connection with the Church and unfortunately, hardly

less so with the Christian faith; the lower classes in their ignorance and simpl city seek Jesus, and they are little preoccupied as to whether they should obey the bishop of Moscow or the bishop of Rome. To use the words of Rozanov:

> There is no hope of union in the sense of fusion or absorption; there is, however, as regards the elimination of that antagonism between the two churches which has prevailed for so many centuries. Russia sincerely dislikes hostility, but the Pope is seeking not so much a pacification of the strife as domination, and Russia will never submit to this foreign control.[45] The reunion of the churches is not possible in the midst of so much bitter controversy, and involving as it does the transfer of allegiance to a foreign power and the change of ritual. A thousand years of separation forms an abyss which is not easily bridged over.[46] If the Catholic Church expects to gain over the Russians in order that they may subserve her own ends. She is greatly deceived. The Russian people will never approach Rome with a view to submission and obedience, but rather to create. The union of the churches is not necessary in the sense that one must be subject to the other. They should all be content to retain their traditional form, and remain faithful to their constitution and their ritual. This diversity does not hinder the members of the various communions from participating in the same mysteries and in the common prayer. We Russians will pray in ours. We will continue to honor the Catholic clergymen as true priests, and the Catholics will look upon our priests as upon their own. When these conditions are realized, the old division will appear simply as a foolish superstition.

We have thus quoted at length the words of this illustrious writer because they seem to us to set forth clearly the Russian position. The union that the Orthodox church would desire with Rome is not unlike the one advocated by Harnack between Catholics and Protestants. The asperities and bitterness of strife should give place to a period of calm so that those who for centuries have been enemies may meet and exchange salutations and know each other better, but let them continue to dwell in their own respective camps. The return of the dispersed members of the family to the one fraternal hearth would be a miracle that the power of God alone could accomplish. Awaiting the occurrence of this miracle, those who sincerely desire the triumph of Christian ideals, will labor to bring about friendly relations between peoples which, as Pobiedonostzev expresses it, are divided in religion, or rather are separated by an *ensemble* of differences—ethnological, national, dogmatic, moral and historical. These differences which have been so conspicuous a factor in the historical development of Russia, render impossible, it seems to us, the con-

[45] *Op. cit.* pp. 410-411.
[46] *Ibid.* p. 413.

version of that country to Catholicism. Another factor in the difficulty is the attitude of the Polish clergy so imbued with anti-Russian fanaticism inspired by religious and patriotic motives, and also that of the Catholic slanderers of Russia who think that the adoption of Catholicism is the only means of checking the internal dissolution of the great Empire.

The present writer is firmly convinced that the Catholic Church is destined to make important conquests in the Russian Empire, especially if the apostolate to that country be not an enterprise in the hands of apostolic diplomats or politicians. But these conquests will always be isolated individual cases, and the best policy for the Church would be to instil into the sacred sciences of Russia something of her own vivifying spirit; to gain Russian sympathy by a more equitable and more Christian appreciation of the Orthodox churches, and to establish between herself and them more friendly and more fraternal relations. People are not converted by strokes of the *knout* (the Russians know it by experience), nor by avalanches of vituperation, but rather by the exercise of a broad spirit of toleration, and of charity, which is quick to pardon; of generosity and affability; of humility and self-abnegation—in a word, of that spirit which has in the past won so many glorious victories for the apostolate of the Catholic Church.[47]

Aurelio Palmieri, O. S. A.

[47] We may mention as animated with this spirit the excellent periodical, entitled *Slavorum Litteræ Theologicae*, published in Prague, by the Rev. P. Spaldak, S. J. This review by the earnestness and moderation of its tone and style has gained for itself the sympathy of even the most fanatical clerical papers in Russia, and has thus rendered an immense service to the Catholic cause.

"FECIT UTRAQUE UNUM"

A. B. Sharpe

"How strange a thing is what men call Pleasure! How wonderful is its relation to pain, which seems to be the opposite of it. They will not come to a man together; but if he posseses the one and gains it, he is almost forced to take the other also, as if they were two distinct things united at one end. And I think that if Æsop had noticed them he would have composed a fable about them, to the effect that God had wished to reconcile them when they were quarrelling, and that, when He could not do that, He joined their ends together."—Plato. Phædo, 60.

The terms Optimism and Pessimism properly denote two antagonistic systems of philosophy; in the popular sense in which they are most commonly used, they indicate two opposite mental tendencies. In this sense, the Optimist is one who habitually sees things at their best; the Pessimist one who sees them at their worst; one, that is to say, is chiefly impressed by the pleasures of life, the other by its pains; and each is implicitly contrasted with the normal person (whether he actually exists, or is merely an ideal) who in the midst of the mingled pains and pleasures of life gives to both alike their due consideration and no more.

Considered as philosophical principles, Optimism and Pessimism are concerned not with the individual point of view, but with the fundamental quality of life which is deduced, in either case, from the single principle to which the existence of the universe is attributed. Thus Optimism regards the world and human life as, on the whole, good and desirable; and whatever in the present order of things is not absolutely good is held to be either an inseparable condition of the existence of good, or else a necessary means for bringing into future existence something still better than what is known as good in the present. In the view of philosophical Pessimism, on the other hand, the world and all that it contains, so far at least as it is reflected in the self-conscious life of rational beings, is essentially bad. The hopefulness of mankind, which is based on a delusive appearance of goodness in some of his experiences, is altogether misleading; it is the result of a kind of trick which nature has played on man in order to tempt him to continue his own existence and the existence of his race. The desire of life is the grand fundamental error, and peace is only to be found by its renunciation.

It has been pointed out by Mr. Sully,[1] in his very complete review of the history and character of Pessimism, that the philosophy is, generally speaking, the result of the mental tendency. A pessimistic philosopher can indeed hardly fail to be one who is personally disposed to take a sombre view of things in general; and no doubt the physiological conditions indicated by Mr. Sully have much to do with the production of such a disposition.

Mr. Caro,[2] again, has characterized Pessimism as the offspring of a period of transition, philosophical and political, in which new needs in the body politic call for new modes of activity from a society wearied with its past efforts, and therefore unable, for the moment, to respond to the call; in consequence, the thought of such a period is "suspendu au dessus du vide infini entre les anciens croyances, et le positivisme qui se resigne à la vie et au monde tels qu' ils sont." But this account of the matter can scarcely be applied to the philosophical system, which however extravagant it may appear, is far from being deficient either in intellectual vigor or in boldness of speculation, and which, in the case of Hartmann at any rate, has much in common with the latest phases of physical science. On the other hand, it is quite certain that the pessimistic temper is confined to no particular period or periods of history, but has at no time failed to be in evidence, more or less conspicuously, among mankind.

It is to be noted, moreover, that however completely the optimistic temperament may be incapacitated for sincere adherence to any form of pessimistic philosophy, it is by no means certain that everyone who is deeply impressed by the evil of life is thereby necessarily predisposed to accept his own personal experience as the true measure of the quality of the universe. Indeed, the opposite is frequently the case. Those whom health, circumstances or temperament has made peculiarly sensitive to the pains of life, while denying them to all appearance a fair share of its pleasures, are often the most speculatively optimistic, even when most hopeless of improvement either for themselves or for mankind in general Personal suffering and incapacity have more often than not the effect of intensifying the sufferer's wistful appreciation of the pleasures enjoyed by others but denied to himself.

Thus it appears evident that there is more in each of these principles than can be accounted for by temperament or circumstances

[1] *Pessimism*, by James Sully. 2nd Edition. 1901.
[2] *Le Pessimisme au XIXe Siècle.* E. M. Caro. 1878.

alone, or by both together. Each is a speculative view of the world and of life, which rests upon weighty considerations of fact, and cannot be dismissed as the mere outcome of abnormal mental dispositions.

It is only within recent times that the two systems have been distinctly formulated and so have come into mutual opposition. In the earlier stages of the intellectual development of mankind there was practically no attempt to discover any abstract principle underlying phenomenal experience. Men were content to let their minds reflect the external world or what they took to be such; and doubtless a considerable amount of distortion took place through the refraction, so to call it, of intellects which had not completely disengaged themselves from foreign matter. Consistent abstract thought was beyond the reach of primitive man, and of his descendants for many ages; and he often failed to distinguish between the pictured representation of the imagination and the truth perceived by the "day light" of the intelligence. Life was to him a pageant, magnificent but confused, in which gods and heroes and strange monsters roamed about the world, their history interwoven with that of common men in the strange web of fate. No unifying principle emerges from the welter of men and things; both good and evil are real, but there is no system in the mode of their occurrence; the nature of things is for the most part inscrutable, and conspires with the co-ordinate powers of necessity and chance to thwart the puny efforts of man

It was not until the human mind had reduced its experiences to some degree of order and had begun to reason about them, that the question as to the good or evil of life as a whole could be asked; and when it had been asked, it was long before any definite answer could be found. Some notion indeed of evil as a necessary element in human existence is to be found in the early Greek conception of the φθόνος or envy of the gods, which would not permit a man to be too prosperous, and which needed to be appeased by sacrifice on the part of those who desired to retain their property to the extent permitted. But life, to Homer and the Greek dramatists, was little more than individual, and in its individual aspect it presented an incalculable variety of fortune. Sometimes it appeared to be on the whole desirable, but for those at least, who had been marked out as the victims of an evil fate, it would have been better never to have lived, or having once been born, to die as soon as might be.[3]

[3]Compare, e. g., the story of Polycrates in Herodotus; and also Homer, Od. xi, 489, with Sophocles Od., Col. 1225.

There is no idea of good and evil as parts of one system, and no unity of principle is sought for. The question could indeed be propounded in general terms, but it was answered only by a particular reference.

The Oriental mind, under the influence possibly of less stimulating physical conditions than those of the West, found an answer to the question in a system which, in spite of obvious shortcomings, seems to have satisfied the requirements of its numerous adherents as an appreciation of the general character of human existence. Buddhism still regards life, theoretically, as a thing essentially undesirable; salvation is to be found only in deliverance from self-conscious existence, and it is to this end that the elaborate methods of Buddhist acseticism, are directed. The Zoroastrian, however, went so far in this recognition of the reality of both evil and good as to attribute them to the action of two mutually antagonistic powers, distinguished from the νείκος and φίλια of Empedocles by their somewhat indefinite personality and a conception which however philosophically untenable, does account for the facts; while the Hebrew founding himself on revelation and devising thence an equally strong sense of the personal origin of both good and evil, frankly admitted the existence of evil as the element in the designs of an omnipotent and all beneficent Creator; though its direct origin is ascribed to the irregular action of created free will.[4]

But the more strenuous Western temperament has consistently refused to be content with a merely speculative solution of the problem, or with one the practical consequences of which are mainly negative. As the Hebrew found his incentive to action in the expressed will of his Creator for the well being of the chosen race, so the Western philosopher, impelled by the "will to live," sought to discover the underlying secrets of nature, with the further design of bringing life and activity into harmony with them. Accordingly, both Plato and Aristotle found in virtue the key to life and the way to happiness. Differently as each conceives the idea of virtue, it is with both an activity; life is an intensely practical thing, and the question is not so much whether it is in itself good or evil, as how mankind may make the best of it. Plato and Aristotle, and their intellectual heirs, were content, like their predecessors, to accept nature as the ultimate fact, as the form of conduct and the mother of thought, without seeking to qualify it as on the whole either good or bad.

[4]Cf. Isai. xiv, 7; Amos iii, 6; Job ii, 10; Eccli. xi, 14, and xv, 14.

"Life, according to nature," or the agreement of the human will with the divine, was the principle of both Stoics and Epicureans; evil, with the former, lay in the aberration of the will from the law of nature, or the will of God, yet evil is overruled for good, and made to harmonize with the plan of the world;[5] though they did not explain how or why this exemption of the evil will from the otherwise universal necessity takes place. The same unresolvable dualism is implied in the new Platonic ideal of escape from the sensuous and absorption in the Divine nature, and reappears in the gnostic conception of the inherent evil of the world and of matter.

On the whole, it may be said that ancient Western thought did not adopt, or even attempt to find, any theory of the quality of existence as a whole; good and evil were ultimate facts, the one to be attained, at least approximately, and the other avoided by pursuing a certain line of conduct which it was the aim of the philosopher to define. One or other appeared in the personal view of individuals to preponderate in the world, according to the experience or temperament of each; but no common measure of the two was conceived, nor was any great difficulty felt about the fact of their co-existence by the leaders of ancient thought, any more than by the unphilosophical majority, whether of ancient or modern times.

Little as ancient speculation tended to throw light on the questions with which modern Pessimism has attempted to deal, its testimony to the reality of both evil and good, coinciding as it does with the unreflecting conviction of the mass of mankind in every age, does at least suggest caution in any attempt to reduce the two to a single natural principle by denying the reality of either. Nor does the important exception of Buddhism give much encouragement by its results, either practical or speculative, to any expectation that the problem may be ultimately solved by its principles or methods.

It was perhaps to be expected that the first efforts of modern speculation to discover a principle of unity should take the direction of Optimism, which was first enunciated as a philosophical principle by Leibnitz. This world, according to him, is the best possible. Evil cannot be excluded from it, because the possibility of evil is inseparable from the very idea of a limited creation; but the actual scheme of things is, in itself, and in its ultimate tendency essentially good. The theory, derived as it was mainly from the *a priori* theological considerations, which permeate the *quasi-monism* of the mona-

[5]Cf. Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus.*

dology, was open to obvious criticism, both on the score of contrary human experience, and on that of its lack of rational demonstration. On the one hand, though the satire of "Candide" misses its point by reason of its burlesque exaggeration, it may be fairly objected, with Hartmann, that though we may grant that this world is the best possible, it is nevertheless "thoroughly wretched, and worse than none at all;"[6] and on the other hand, the theory of Leibnitz fails, on its own principles, to assign a sufficient reason for the unquestionable evils of life, or to make adequate provision for their existence in a scheme of which the fundamental principle is good. That evil is a mode of good may be admitted, on the hypothesis that good is the underlying foundation and ultimate aim of creation; but the *a priori* method admits equally of the contrary hypothesis, according to which good must with equal reason be considered a mode of evil.

The view incidentally expressed by Spinoza, and before him by Giordano Bruno, that evil is merely relative, and depends on the attitude of the individual towards a nature which in itself is neither good nor evil, (a view which appears to be widely adopted at the present day), really begs the question: since on Spinozistic principles the individual is himself the product of nature, and the antagonistic attitude of nature, as manifested in the individual, to itself as constituting his environment, is left unexplained.

The difficulty under which Optimism labors is plainly due to the reality of evil in human experience, which is hopelessly at variance with any theory of its fundamental identity with good; and the obscurity in which the final destiny of the universe is involved, reduces any argument drawn from its supposed character to the position of an unverifiable hypothesis.

The contrary theory of philosophical Pessismim is originally due to Schopenhauer. In his system the idea of the essentially evil character of existence is closely connected with his ontological theory. Adopting and considerably widening the Kantian notion of the relativity of knowledge, he asserts that the external world has no real existence apart from the mind by which it is known. The mind, however, gets what may be called a partial glimpse of the "thing in itself," by its knowledge of the individual will with which it is associated in each separate personality.[7] It is thus that the mind

[6] *Philosophy of the Unconscious.* Metaphysic of the Unconscious, ch. xiv. English Transl. Coupland.

[7] *The World as Will and Idea,* Books I and II; and *Criticism of the Kantian Philosophy.* (Eng. Transl. Haldam and Kemp.)

knows all that can be known of the universe external to itself; for the universal will is all that answers to the idea of the thing in itself; and being known by the intelligence immediately and without any phenomenal representation, it is thus freed from the law of mere relativity to which knowledge of all other things is subject. Thus the will is prior to the intelligence; since it can be known only in action, and its action must therefore precede the knowledge of it. Hence, as the will is evidently the fundamental element of the individual nature, so in the universe Will is the foundation, and the essential principle of existence. Consciousness, the idea or representation (Vorstellung), is the final development of Will, or being, which in itself is unconscious and blind. But conscious existence is evil; Will and Idea are at variance with one another; the "will to live" is the blind effort of nature to perpetuate itself in and through the individual; and the self-conscious co-operation of the intellect with the blind force of the universal will, as manifested in the individual and his desires, is the source of all the pain and sorrow of human life.

Pain is a positive reality; but pleasure is negative, being the mere temporary absence of pain. That this is appears from the fact that pain creates a definite impression, whereas pleasure does not; we become conscious of pleasure only by contrast with pain, but the sensation of pain is distinct in itself, and apart from any contrasted sensation. Thus not only is life preponderantly painful, but pain is its fundamental principle; the illusive pursuit of happiness, as of something attainable, is brought about by a deception which nature practises upon the intelligence, in order to carry out its purpose of self-perpetuation. Accordingly, the true wisdom is to accept life as the painful and undesirable thing it really is; to renounce the will to live, and so to minimise the pain of living, which the pursuit of happiness, foredoomed as it is to failure, can only tend to accentuate.

Schopenhauer claims a spiritual relationship with the ascetic renunciation of the desire of life which is common, in his view, to Buddhism and Christianity; he agrees with the former and differs from the latter in his denial of personal immortality. With him, immortality is collective, not individual, and consists in the perpetual reproduction of the universal will of separate intelligences in which it is mirrored or represented.[8]

[8] *The World as Will and Idea*, Book IV, and Supplement.

Schopenhauer is closely followed in his view of existence by Hartmann, who, however, substitutes the Unconscious (Unbewüsst) for Schopenhauer's Will. The Unconscious, which includes both Will and Idea, is essential being; it rises into consciousness in the individual, in whose acts, both mental and physical, it still takes an important part.[9] But existence, or at least the consciousness of it, is an unmixed evil, by reason of the vast preponderance of pain over pleasure, the preponderance being greater in proportion to the greater development of consciousness; though it may be somewhat mitigated by regard and care for the welfare of others, and conformity to the laws of duty. We are to "make the ends of the unconscious the ends of our consciousness."[10] Morality is, however, "autonomous"; its principles and sanctions spring from within, and are not really imposed from without, as theistic systems have imagined them to be. The ultimate goal of the human race is extinction. When mankind becomes alive to its true condition, it will inevitably put an end to itself; and so the present chapter of the development of the unconscious will at last be closed by the return of the suffering Will, under the guidance of Intelligence, to the negative bliss of unconsciousness.[11] It is evident enough that both these theories are open to a considerable amount of criticism, on several grounds. It will be enough for our present purpose to point out that in both the use of terms is misleading, and amounts to little more than an analogical definition of the unknown terms of the known. Our knowledge of what lies behind phenomena is not increased by the use in regard to it of terms which apart from phenomena have no meaning; will is only known to us as guided by intelligence, and unconscious intelligence is really nothing more or less than a self-contradiction; and the explanation of the universe which the method of Schopenhauer or of Hartmann would found upon the basis of a purely fanciful dovetailing of the transcendental with the phenomenal fails, as all other monistic systems fail, just at the point which tests and determines their value, namely the transition of the ideal to the real, the transcendental to the phenomenal. It matters little whether the system be idealistic or materialistic—whether thought is said to be a function of matter, or matter a result of thought; the transition from one to the other eludes observation and imagination alike, and Realist,

[9] *Philosophy of the Unconscious.* Metaphysic of the Unconscious. Ch. I-XII.
[10] *Ib.* XIV, and cf. *The Religion of the Future.*
[11] *Philosophy of the Unconscious.* Metaph. of the Unconsc. ch. XIII.

Idealist and Materialist are as helpless before it as theologians before the mystery of Creation.[12]

It is, in fact, as difficult for Pessimism to account for the existence of good as for Optimism to account for the existence of evil. Either good or evil is foreign to each system, and cannot be provided for except by the introduction of a new extraneous principle, such as necessity, or the exigencies of moral government, on the one hand; or, on the other, a supposed deception practised by an unconscious force. We have no means of determining whether the world we know is the best possible or not, whether our point of view is Leibnitz's or Hartmann's; and the notion of "metaphysical" evil, which according to Leibnitz is involved in the very idea of a limited creation (as in point of fact it is) does not help us to determine how far the life of humanity may be dominated by evil which is more than metaphysical. But on the other hand, good, whether it is held to be a quality of the external world in itself, or merely an aspect of the relation between that external world and self-conscious human beings, has a certain unquestionable reality of its own. If good and evil are merely ideas, it still has to be shown how we became possessed of them; the general conception of each must have its root and foundation somewhere in the nature of things, else it could have no existence in the mind. In other words, if we are to confine our view to the facts of experience—without looking beyond them for a solvent, either in the shape of theology, natural or revealed, or in that of mere hypothesis, we are confronted with this problem. Nature (in the widest sense) must be either good or evil, or neither, or both. If good, how has it been able to bring about the existence of evil? If evil, how can it be the source of good? If it is neither, how can it have given birth to both; and if it is both, how can such a self-contradiction exist? No fifth hypothesis is conceivable; and on each of the four conceivable ones we are confronted with an obstinate dualism, which cannot be resolved by any monistic principle whatever. The somewhat crude form of idealistic monism which seeks

[12]Hartmann's criticism of Hegel is, *mutatis mutandis*, precisely applicable to himself. "Hegel in his logic measured the Platonic realm of the *per se* existing Idea; he tried to surprise the Idea in the process of the eternal self-deliverance from barest being. But when the realm of the *per se* existing Idea had been traversed in all directions, the principle reached its limits; for though the Idea was omnipotent in its own sphere, one thing remained unattainable by it, the *res, reality*; for real is just that which cannot be created by mere thought." (Schelling, 1, 3, p. 364. (Metaphysic of the Unconscious, xv, 1).

to escape from the supposed difficulties of revealed religion by an assertion of Divine Immanence as an exclusive principle, has only succeeded in substituting for religious difficulties a hopeless philosophical autonomy.[13]

Those who adopt such a principle as the ultimate solvent of the "riddle of the universe" are forced to take refuge in the tacit attribution either of intelligence or consciousness to an *ex hypothesi* unintelligent and unconscious source of being; or to credit a supposed absolute goodness with the parentage of evil, or vice versa—just as the existence of good as a matter of experience is the fatal obstacle to the tenability of any complete theory of pessimism, so curiously enough, the existence of evil is one of the most serious difficulties in the way of any non-theistic interpretation of the universe.

It would be a great mistake to consider philosophical pessimism as a mere absurdity. It is very far indeed from being so. Schopenhauer and Hartmann have at least rendered this service to philosophical and theological speculation, that they have brought into strong relief the necessity, too frequently evaded, of reckoning with the element of evil in life, as a fact which cannot be explained away, but for which a place must be found in any comprehensive theory of the nature of existence. If the unavoidable decrees of Fate, and the vengeance of pursuing Furies are no longer permissible ideas, we must find some equally definite principle to account for the results ascribed to their influence on human affairs. Though it is true that evil has no positive existence—that it is in itself a negation or "privatio," and is thus merely an aspect of the relation of mankind to its environment, we are none the less bound to admit the reality of evil as an experience, and as an idea, which must have its foundation and origin in some principle of the constitution of things to which the existence of man and that of his environment are alike due. Such a view of evil was undoubtedly present to the mind of St. Augustine, and found a place, though not a very clearly defined one, in the mystical and not wholly orthodox speculations of Echhart. The evil of the world is compared by the former to the shadows in a picture, or the contrasted tones in a piece of music; sin—the extreme form of evil in his view—is pleasing to God, not in itself, but by reason of the place it occupies (i. e. in association with retributive suffering) in the harmonious totality of creation.[14]

[13]See *The Substance of Faith*, by Sir Oliver Lodge; *The New Theology*, by Rev. R. J. Campbell.

[14]S. Aug. *de Gen. ad litt.* imperf. 5, 3; *Civ. Dei* 2, 18; and *Gen ad litt.* 3.

Evil, he says again, in its penal aspect, has "the nature of good"; but this is not a denial of the distinctive character of evil, but the attribution to it of a share in the perfection of the whole, which is the kind of good he has in view. Though it was only in passing references such as these that St. Augustine addressed himself to the questions with which pessimism is concerned, viewing them as details in the system of theology rather than as constituting a distinct subject of investigation, it is nevertheless on the conception suggested by him, of "metaphysical evil" or "malum naturæ," which Leibnitz adopted from St. Thomas, that the solution of the problem would seem to depend. Starting with the fact that evil in this sense is a necessary feature of the constitution of the world, by way of contrast, limitation and repression,[16] it is not difficult to perceive further that the suffering and moral lapses of man are due to his failure to correspond with the true order of the world in which he is placed; the action of his free will converting the "metaphysical" evil which is inherent in the system of the world into spiritual and moral evil, and thereby bringing upon him the suffering which, for a rational being, is essentially involved in antagonism to the physical and moral order of his environment, and by which as a makeweight, the due balance and harmony of creation is preserved. In other words, sin and suffering are inseparable from one another,[17] each being but a different aspect of the misdirection of the human will.[18]

Thus the Christian Theodicy really embodies all that can be rightly claimed on behalf of either pessimism or optimism. For the benevolence of the Divine Creator is in no way impugned by the attribution to Him of the origin of human free will, to which the direct responsibility for the existence of other evil than metaphysical must be ascribed; since the present misuse of it could neither impair the goodness of the act of creation, nor hinder the act from taking place (unless the creative will could have been made contingent on the created, which is inconceivable) and while good and evil have each a place in the Christian system, both contribute to the perfection of the whole, which, whether the best possible or not, is essentially good. The nature of the act of creation is indeed a mystery which refuses to yield up its secret; but, as has been said, it is no more hidden than is

[15]Cf. *Summa.* II. ii, 19. 1 c.

[16]*Summa.* I, 49, 2.

[17]*Ib.* I, 19, 6. 1.

[18]This subject is more fully treated in *Evil, Its Nature and Cause,* (Westminster Lectures, 1906).

the elusive transition of the real to the ideal, or of the ideal to the real, in which an act of faith is demanded, on the slightest possible grounds, by non-Christian philosophies.

Moreover, the Christian system is the only one which has been, or indeed can be submitted to the practical test which common sense regards as conclusive. The asceticism advocated by Schopenhauer, and the altruism of Hartmann are at best but counsels of despair; and the motive proposed is insufficient to give to either the impulse necessary for practical application: whereas Christian charity, and self-sacrifice even to the point of extreme austerity, are things of every day experience, and lead men not to a merely negative state in which pain is minimised, but to a condition of positive happiness both in the present and in the future. In Christianity we find the joyous outlook on life which Optimism commends to us, and which the naive naturalism of the Pagan world only partially attained; but it is the fruit of the methods from which Schopenhauer and Hartmann would have us hope for nothing but, at best, a blank unconsciousness. It is in the knowledge, through reason and revelation of a Divine Creator that the point of reconciliation between the two systems is found.

What have been called the pessimistic and the optimistic temperaments must no doubt exist within the Christian Church as well as without. But the practical system of Christianity (which it must be remembered is prior both in time and in authority to its philosophy) provides a place for each, in which each is fully at home, and finds no inconsistency in the close companionship of its opposite. A Francis of Sales and a Rancé are not less dissimilar than an Antisthenes and an Aristippus; but the old fold of the Church is amply wide enough for both.

Pessimism and Optimism thus meet and are reconciled in the Christian view of life, and their union is effected in that transcendental sphere into which every system of philosophy has sought to penetrate; but the Christian finds in revelation a basis for his philosophical principles which, for him at least, has a stability which no other philosophy can claim. Philosophy by itself can, as we have seen, give no certain answer to the question that men are driven to ask about the value and meaning of life; it cannot resolve the dualism of good and evil; and physical science which deals only with the palpable and ponderable, cannot so much as recognise the existence of the problem. But Christianity provides a solvent which, whatever else may be thought of it, is at least an adequate one—and Pessimism has rendered no small service to Christianity by emphasising its uniquely synthetic character from a fresh point of view.

A. W. Sharpe.

RESOURCES OF THE ARABIC LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Gabriel Oussani, D. D.

The Arabic tongue, although in its historical career and literary development one of the latest of the Semitic languages is, nevertheless, on account of its comparatively archaic character, its richness, and the prodigious literature it has produced, justly considered to be not only the most important of the Semitic tongues, but also among the foremost human languages in general. Its grammar is remarkably scientific, logical, and rich in forms; its syntax is most elaborate, and the beauty and harmony of the language are as captivating as its poetry is original and charming. The Arabic vocabulary is extravagantly rich, and the enormous Arabic literature, covering almost every branch of human science, sacred and profane, is so bewildering that it has hardly been surpassed or even equalled in any other language, ancient or modern. A large amount of this literature, comprising thousands of volumes, has already been published, and some of it translated, in the East and in the West; but by far the greater part has been either entirely lost, or still lies in manuscript form in hundreds of private and public libraries, collections, museums and mosques in Asia, Egypt Europe, and America.

The boundless vocabulary and wealth of synonyms of the Arabic language is proverbial. We are told, for example, that an Arab philologist wrote a book on the 500 names given to the "lion;" another gives 200 words for "serpent," Firuzabadi, the Arabian Webster, is said to have written a sort of supplement on the words for "honey" and to have left it incomplete at the eightieth word: we are also told that there are over 1,000 different terms in Arabic for "sword." The well known German scholar De Hammer Purgstall wrote a book on the different Arabic words for "camel" and found them to be not less than 7544. An Arabic lexicographer claimed that the vocabulary of Arabic contains 12,305,412 words (?). Apart from these exaggerations, and considering the fact that the majority of the so-called Arabic "synonyms" were originally adjectives or epithets, dialect-forms and poetical contortions, it must still be admitted that in richness of diction

Arabic is without a peer in any langauge. The importance of Arabic for the comparative study of Semitic grammar and philology is as great as that of Sanscrit for Indo-European philology. It has preserved many of the primitive Semitic forms of speech which have either completely or partially disappeared from its sister languages; and while it is not altogether safe to affirm that Arabic, in its classical form, represents the nearest possible approach to primitive Semitic speech, still on the whole it has preserved more of the features and forms of that primitive speech than either Assyrian, Canaanitish, or Aramaic. Its value for the study of Hebrew and the Old Testament in general is so evident that it scarcely needs to be insisted upon.

As a literary language Arabic does not date farther back than the 5th or 6th century of the Christian Era, and the earlier history of this important branch of Semitic speech is involved in much obscurity. In fact, until the discovery of the so-called South-Arabian inscriptions, little or nothing was known in regard to it. From these and other inscriptions it clearly appears that the Arabs of North and South Arabia had reduced their language to writing at a much earlier time than was formerly supposed, some of the southern inscriptions dating from the 10th century B. C. The North-Arabian or so-called Thamudic inscriptions, thus far discovered, are comparatively few and of little importance. Those found in N. W. Arabic, or Safa, (hence called Safaic) are greater in number; but those discovered in Southern Arabia, mainly by the Austrian traveler, Edward Glaser, are much more numerous and are of considerable historical and linguistic importance. These exhibit four principal dialects. Minnean, Sabean, Hadramautic, and Catabanian. Although the two latter are at present repre ented by very few texts, their dialectic peculiarities are quite clearly marked and it can be asserted that both the Hadramautic and Catabanian are more closely related to the Minnean than to the Sabean. The Minnean and the Sabean dialects, of which numerous monuments exist, exhibit strongly marked differences in regard to grammer and vocabulary. These differences can be explained, at least in part, on the ground of the greater age of the Minnean as compared with the Sabean. It is also to be noted that, while the grammatical peculiarities of the Minean point to an older period of linguistic development, the vocabulary of Sabean is more closely related to that of classical Arabic. As is the case with all Semitic systems of writing, except the Assyro-Babylonian, the South Arabian alphabet does not represent the vowels,

and, therefore, a detailed knowledge of the forms of these dialects is rendered difficult.

All at once, in the 6th century of the Christian Era, we meet with a perfectly developed Arabic language, surprisingly rich in forms and vocabulary, and by reason of its extreme flexibility, singularly adapted to the requirements of poetic composition. This phenomenon, which has no parallel in any other language, cannot be accounted for as a spontaneous and sudden transformation. It must have been the result of a gradual development, extending over a very long time. The period embracing the 6th and 7th centuries of our Era, marks the real golden age of Arabic poetry; all subsequent poetical productions are imitations of these admirable ante-Islamic models.

But it is an error, as Noldeke has already pointed out, to suppose that the language of the ancient Arabic poets was the language of ordinary life; still less does the Koran exhibit the language in its spoken form. Ancient Arabic poetry is marked throughout by a certain tendency to artificiality and mannerism, and in order to obtain an idea of the ordinary language of the ancient Bedouins, we must have recourse to the prose of the ancient traditions (Hadiths), the genuine accounts of the deeds of the Prophet and of his companions, and the stories concerning the battles and adventures of the Bedouins in the heathenish period and in the earlier days of Islam. The formation of this "dialectus poetica," in which only poetical compositions were written, and in which purer forms were used and colloquial expressions were avoided, marks a noble effort and a splendid achievement on the part of the ante-Islamic Arabs, and is mainly due to their frequent yearly gatherings in certain public places or markets, of which the fair of 'Ukad was the most famous. This fair was not only a great market open annually to all the tribes of Arabia, it was also a sort of literary gathering whither the warrior poets resorted to celebrate their exploits in rhyming verses, and peacefully to contend for the prize. It was at these gatherings that the various dialects of Arabia became fused into a literary language, the language of poetry which afterwards became the standard dialect now known as classical Arabic.

Furthermore, at the time of the Prophet, the dialect of the tribe of Koraish, which had already acquired a certain supremacy, was fixed by the Koran as the future literary language of the whole nation. Had it not been for this circumstance, we might have known Arabic in the form of half a dozen languages, differing from one another almost as

widely as the modern languages of northern India or the members of the Romance group.

From the time of Mohammed down to our own days Arabic, as a literary and as a spoken language, has continued to hold an almost absolute supremacy over all Western Asia. As a spoken language, it is very difficult to define its boundaries. In certain countries, Arabia, Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia it holds exclusive sway; in others, like Tunis, Algeria, Morocco, and many other Berber states and tribes, it is the tongue most commonly used. It is also spoken in Malta, in certain towns of Persia and India, by about fifteen different tribes of Northeastern and Northwestern Africa, in some parts of the Sahara, and even by some tribes in Southern and in Equatorial Africa. These various Arabic dialects are not only very different from classical Arabic, but they also differ from each other as much as the various Romance languages; and, consequently, men from Mesopotamia, Morocco, and the interior of Arabia for example, understand one another with difficulty, if indeed at all.

Native Arabic writers divide the history of their literature into two periods; the pre-Islamic and post-Islamic; the first covering the period preceding Islam, the second extending from the time of Mohammad (VII century, A. D.) down to our own day.

This division, based merely on an irrelevant religious event, is unsatisfactory; but for our present purpose it can safely be adopted. The literary productions of the first period, the real golden age of Arabic poetry, consist exclusively of poetical compositions, in which the language is pure, the diction elegant, the imagery original and striking, and the art of versifying and rhythm unsurpassed.

Ante-Islamic, or better, ancient Arabic poetry has come down to us in several later collections; principal among them are: (1) The *Seven Mu'allakat* or "Hanging Poems," so called according to Moslim tradition, from the fact that on account of their excellence, they were hung up in some public temple, but in all probability the word means simply "Poems written on parchment." They were collected by Al-Hammad (VIII century A. D.), and attributed to the poets Imru'ul, Quais, Tarafa, Zoheyr, Lebid, 'Amr ibn Kulthum, Harith ibn Hillizal and 'Antara respectively, (according to some, the last two poets should be Nabigha and Al A'sha instead); (2) The "Mufaddaliyyat" poems, collected by Al-Mufaddal, about the VIII, century A. D.; (3) *Al-Hamasa* poems collected by the poet Abu-Tammam of the IX century A. D.; (4) The *Hudailite poems*, attributed to several poets of the

Hudail tribe, S. W. of Mecca, and collected about the IX century, A. D.; (5) The *Giamharat Ash'ar ul 'Arab,* (IX-X centuries A. D.); (6) The famous *Kitab ul Aghani* i. e. "the Book of Songs," collected by Abul Faraj of Isfahan, and consisting of 21 volumes; and finally (7) a few other collections of lesser extent and value and of doubtful origin. The main topic of these numerous poetical compositions are wars, razzias, tribal and personal vendettas, personal bravery, love, woman and wine. The most illustrious of the poets of this period, besides the nine mentioned above, are 'Alqama, Muhalhil, Ta'-abbata—Sharran, Shanfara, 'Urwa ibn al Ward, Dhu'l Asba'al 'Adwani, 'Abid ibn al Abras, Hatim of Tay, 'Umayya ibn abul-Salt, Ka'b ibn Zuhair, the poetess Al Khansa, famous for her elegies, and many others, some of whom like Samau'al (Samuel), 'Adi ibn Zaid and others were either Jews or Christians. These two religious sects, as we know, had already some flourishing settlements in Yemen, Ghassan, Hira, and other parts of Arabia. But the thesis lately advanced by the Jesuit scholar, L. Sheikho, of the Catholic University of Beirut, Syria, viz. that the majority of these ancient Arabian poets were Christians, has met with little support from occidental scholars.

The second period properly begins with the "Koran" and the *Hadiths* or "oral traditions," covering Mohammed's life and deeds and those of his companions.

In this second period of the history of Arabic literature three distinct epochs are to be distinguished: (1) The "Umayyad period," running from the extinction of the Medina Caliphate and the successful revolt of Moawiya, down to the establishment of the Abbaside Caliphate, i e., from 660 to 750 A. D.; (2) the "Abbaside period," running from the establishment of the Abbaside Caliphate to the fall of Bagdad and the overthrow of the Abbaside dynasty by the hands of the Mongols, i. e., from 750 to 1258 A. D.; (3) the "Osmanli" or "modern period," which carries us down to the present time.

During the Umayyad period, in which Islam for the first time came into contact with the Graeco-Syrian world and civilization, Arabic literature is mainly represented by several poets, some of whom rank among the best. Such are the Christian poet, Al-Akhtal, of the tribe of Taghlib, who became court-poet of the Umayyads in Damascus (A. D. 710), and who is looked upon by the majority of Arabic literateurs as the greatest post-Islamic poet; Farazdaq, of the tribe of Tamim (641-728), famous for his satires; Jarir, of Yamama, the favorite poet of his time (A. D. 728), Kuthayyir of Hijaz; Dhul-

Rumma, and the poetess Laila al-Akhya Liyya, well known for her beautiful elegies over her beloved Tauba ibn al-Humayyir. To these must be added the two Christian poets, Abdallah ibn al-Mukhariq and Al-Qutami; also Asha Hamdan, of Kufa, a Koran reader and lawyer; Al-Kumait, famous for his wonderful knowledge of the various dialects of the Arab tribes, and the well-known Hammad ibn Shabur, surnamed "Al-Rawiya" or the "Quoter"—for he could quote by heart thousands of ancient Arabic poems, to whom we owe the collection of the seven *Mu'allaqat*, mentioned above.

The second, or Abbaside period, forms undoubtedly the most glorious epoch in the history of Arabic civilization, science, literature, and arts. Under this dynasty, the Caliphate was transferred from Dasmacus, the capital of the Umayyad dynasty, to Bagdad in Babylonia. Greek literature and civilization, i. e., history, theology, philosophy, medicine, mathematics, astronomy, and the natural sciences were then ardently and successfully cultivated by the Christian Nestorians and Jacobites, through all Mesopotamia and Persia, and the Arabs of the Abbaside period were in continuous contact with these Christians who initiated them into the secrets of Greek and Occidental civilization and learning. The educated native Arabs and especially the Arabized Persians, applied themselves first to the study of their own language and poetry, and to the exegesis of the Koran, and then to philosophy, theology, medicine, astronomy, and the natural sciences, in some of which they achieved success and even originality. The following is but a very meagre sketch or rather enumeration of the principal poets, grammarians, historians, philosophers, and writers who flourished during the long and glorious Abbaside dynasty.

Among the poets are Abu-Nawwas, of Al-Ahwaz, in Susiana, (756-810), the erotic and bacchic poet of Harun al-Rashid, and well-known for his licentiousness of speech and conduct; Muslim ibn al-Walid, another not less erotic poet, (747-803); Abul 'Atahiya, of the tribe of 'Anaza, the Ecclesiastes of Arabic poetry (748-828); Ibrahim of Mossul, and his son Ishaq (Isaac), both famous as poets and singers; Di 'bil, of Kufa, (765-860: Al-Bukhturi, of the tribe of Tay (820-897), and the collector of a *Hamasa* different from that of Abu Tammam; Al-Mutanabbi, of Kufa, (905-965), who together with Al-Akhtal is regarded as the greatest Arabic poet of post-Islamic times. His poetry and diction is noble and elegant and the thought often sublime; Abu Firas, of Hamadan; Abul-Ala' Al-Marrai, of Syrian descent,

who is justly considered to be the 'Umar al-Khayyam of Arabic poetry; Al-Busti, of Persian origin (971-1010), Al-Busiri (1211-1294), and many others who flourished in Arabia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Persia, Egypt, Spain and Sicily. Among those who excelled in the art of writing rhymed prose, mention must be made of Ibn-Nubata (946-984); Abu Bakr al Khawarizmi (934-993 or 1002). and especially Badi' ul-zaman, of Hamadan (990-1008), the originator of the so-called *Maqamat* or "Seances"; and Hariri, of Basra, (1054-1122), author of the famous and almost inimitable *Maqamat* in which the, beauty, flexibility, and extraordinary richness of the Arabic language are exhibited at the zenith of their perfection. Hariri's *Maqamat*, have been more or less successfully translated into French and English.

As to the grammatical art, there is hardly a language whose forms and syntax have been submitted to such keen and scientific study as Arabic. The most minute and naive details of phonetics, grammar and syntax were carefully studied and debated, with the result that several schools of grammarians arose, such as that of Kufa, Bagdad, and Basra. The most eminent Arabic grammarians and philologists were of foreign extraction, especially Persian, who in acquiring and mastering the difficult language, were naturally compelled to make a deeper study of it than the native Arabs. The following are the principal scholars who engaged in this work: Abul 'Aswad; 'Isa Ibn 'Umar al-Thaqafi (A. D. 766); Khalil, to whom is ascribed the invention of the rules of Arabic prosody; Sibawaihi (or better Sibuya), of Persian origin, author of the *Kitab* or "Book" par excellence, the most authoritative grammar of Arabic (A. D. 793 or 796); Mu'arrij, (A. D. 810); Ibn Shumail (A. D. 818); Qutrub (A. D. 821); 'Abu 'Ubaida ibn al Muthanna, (728-825), of Jewish extraction, who is said to have written two hundred grammatical treatises; Abu Zaid al-Ansari (A. D. 820); Al-'Asma'i, (739-831), one of the greatest Arabic literateurs, grammarians, and philosogists, and an acknowledged authority on ancient Arabic poetry and dialectology; Al-Akhfash, (A. D. 835), a pupil of Sibawaihi, and to whom we owe the final redaction and preservation of his master's *Kitab*; Ibn Ishaq (A. D. 840); Al-Sukkari (827-888), the collector of the *Hudailite* poems, and of the *Diwan* of Imru ul-Quais; Al-Mubbarrad, (826-988), author of the grammatical work called *Al-Kamil*; Ibn Duraid, (837-934), a poet and a man of great learning, and the author of a dictionary and book on the genealogies of the Arab tribes; Ibn al-Sarraj, (A. D. 929); Al-Sirafi, (A. D. 979); Al-Kisa'i, (A. D. 805), one of the greatest

grammarians of the Kufa school; Al-Mufaddal al-Dabbi, (A. D. 786), the collector of the *Mufaddaliyyat* poems, and of ancient Arabic proverbs; Ibn al 'A'rabi, (A. D. 846), a man of prodigious memory and of extraordinary knowledge of the rarest forms of Arabic grammar and vocabulary; Ibn al-Sikkit, (A. D. 857); Ibn al-Anbari, (885-939); Ibn Qutaiba, (828-889), grammarian, historian, theologian, and an authority on ancient Arabic poetry; Al-Dinawri, (A. D. 895); Al-Azhari, (A. D. 891); Al Anbari, (1119-1118); Al-Tha'alibi, (961-1038), of Persian origin and a great polygraph; Al-Maidani, (A. D. 1124), the author of the most valuable collection of Arabic proverbs; Al-Zamakhshari, (1074-1143), the author of the well-known Arabic grammar called *Al-Mufassal*; Ibn Ya'ish, (1158-1249), the authoritative commentator of Zamakhshari's *Mufassal*, and many others, whose names, for brevity's sake, must be omitted.

Among the Arabs, as among all Oriental peoples, the Hebrews included, history writing did not attain the same degree of perfection as among the Greeks, the Romans, and other occidental nations. The Oriental way of writing history has nothing in common with our modern Occidental method; it consists of grouping together extracts and documents of various sources, dates, and authorship, without any attempt at examining their historical credibility, or harmonizing their discrepancies, or indicating their origin and authorship. Hence all oriental histories are essentially compilations and are consequently far inferior to our Western productions in that branch of science.

The earliest specimens of history-writing among the Arabs are to be found in the so-called *Hadith* or "traditions" concerning the deeds of Mohammed, his companions, and immediate successors, which traditions form the real basis of Koranic exegesis and Moslem theology and jurisprudence. These "traditions," or *Maghazi* (wars), or biographies of Mohammed are so numerous and voluminous that they form in themselves a complete library and quite an absorbing branch of Arabic studies.

One of the earliest of these biographies is that of Ibn Ishaq, (A. D. 768) which, although actually lost, is, nevertheless, constantly quoted and to a great extent preserved in later biographies and histories such as that of Ibn Hisham and others. Next comes the historian Al-Wakidi, (747-823), author of the *Kitab al Maghazi* or "Book of the Wars"; Ibn Sa'd, (A. D. 845), the author of a collection of biographies of Mohammed and his successors; Al-Azraqi, (A. D. 858), and Al-Fakihi, (A. D. 885), each of whom wrote a history of Mecca;

Ibn Zabala, author of a history of Medina, and many other historians who wrote the local histories of Basra, Kufa, Wasit, Raqqa, Harran, Isphahan, Bukhara, Damascus, Bagdad, etc. Ibn al Kalbi, (A. D. 763), and his son (A. D. 819), collected and wrote a very detailed history of the genealogies of the ancient Arabs, of their idols and heathenish customs. Al-Mada'ini, (753-830), is said to have written one hundred and eleven books on the prophet and his successors. Al-Zubair ibn Bakkar, (A. D. 870); Al- Baldahuri, (A. D. 892), the author of a very valuable *History of the Moslem Conquest*, a *Genealogy of Mohammed's Successors and Companions* and other works. But the greatest of all Arabic and Oriental Historians is Tabari, (838-923), whose masterly, accurate, and voluminous *Annals* (published in Leyden by several leading Arabic scholars of Europe in 20 volumes), are a unique and a most precious mine of accurate historical records and information. Of him it is said that for forty years he wrote forty sheets a day, or 600,000 sheets in all, thus about 600 volumes of 1,000 sheets each. Al-Suli, (A. D. 946), wrote a history of the ancient Arabic poets, and of the Abbaside Caliphs. Mas'udi, (A. D. 957), is the author of the *Golden Meadows*, a mine of information on Arabic and Oriental history and civilization, which is itself but an extract from a much larger work, in 30 volumes by the same author. Abu-l Faraj al-'Isfahani, (897-967), wrote the famous *Book of Songs* in 21 volumes, which is, in all probability, the most valuable and precious work ever produced by an Arabic writer, and undoubtedly the most complete collection of ancient Arabic poetry, together with the lives of these poets and a vast number of historical and literary anecdotes. Finally mention must be made of the well-known book, generally called *Fihrist*, or "Index," which is a unique and a very valuable bibliographical treatise written by Ibn Ishaq ibn abi Ya 'qub al Nadim, surnamed "Al-Warraq" or "Bookseller," (A. D. 996). This bibliography gives one an idea of the immense richness of Arabic literature, though unfortunately most of the books it mentions have been completely lost. The number of Arabic books and treatises catalogued in the *Fihrist*, which covers only the first four centuries of the Mohammedan era, (i. e. VII-X centuries A. D.), is more than 20,000.

Besides these historical works, of a more or less general character, the Abbaside period produced an immense number of local and provincial histories, such as those of Egypt, Africa, Mesopotamia, Persia, Syria, Arabia, India, Spain, Sicily, and also of "Universal Histories," such as that of the great historians, Ibn-al Athir, of Mesopotamia,

(XII-XIII centuries A. D.), published in 12 volumes. This same author also wrote a historical treatise dealing with the seven thousand five hundred companions of the Prophet. Another historian is Abu'l Faraj, better known as Bar-Hebræus, the famous Maphrian of the Jacobite church, and the most learned writer of the Christian Orient (1226-1289). He wrote in Arabic an *Epitome of Dynasties*, published in the East and in the West.

Another important branch of studies, in which the learned Arabs of the Abbaside dynasty produced numerous and excellent works, deals with the Koran, its history and exegesis, Moslem theology and mystics, law and jurisprudence.

In the field of philosophy, natural sciences, and mathematics, the Arabs of the Abbaside dynasty produced some very valuable but not original works. We have already remarked how Greek philosophy and culture found their way among the Arabs through the Christian Nestorians and Jacobites of Mesopotamia and Babylonia in the eighth and ninth centuries of the Christian era. These had already translated into Syriac, for their own use, the principal works of Greek philosophy and on these translations the learned Arabs based their own versions and studies. It is, moreover, a well known fact that through the medium of Arabised Spain the study of Greek philosophy was once more introduced into the awakening Europe of the early Middle Ages. Al-Mansur, the second of the Abbaside Caliphs (754-775), commanded that the most important philosophical productions of foreign nations be translated into Arabic, such as the Indian book of *Kalila and Dimna* (the *Panciatantra*), translated by Ibn al-Muqaffa' from the Pahlavi version; the *Siddhanta*, an Indian Astronomical treatise; Ptolemy's *Astronomy*, better known as the *Almagest;* Euclid's *Geometry* and other works of Greek, Syriac, and Persian origin. Al-Mamun, another Abbaside Caliph (813-833), founded the great university of Bagdad, with its famous library and observatory, and ordered more Greek works to be translated into Arabic, such as Aristotle's *Politics*, by Yuhanna ibn Batriq (a Christian, A. D. 815), his *Theology* (?) after Porphyry, etc., etc....Abu Hunain ibn Ishaq (A Christian, A. D. 873) became the personal medical attendent of the Caliph Al-Mutawalkil, and wrote, as well as translated from the Greek, numerous works on philosophy, botany, and medicine, especially those of Aristotle, Plato, Galen, Dioscorides, and Hippocrates. He is also said to have translated from the Greek the entire Old Testament. His son, Ishaq ibn Hunain (A. D. 910) was also a distinguished philoso-

pher and translated Aristotle's *Categories*. Hubaish ibn Hassan, the nephew of Ishaq, translated other works. Abu Bishr Matta Ibn Yunus, (a Christian, A. D. 940) translated Aristotle's *Ars Poetica*. All of these and many other Christians, (mostly Nestorians) had found great favour in the eyes of the earlier Abbaside Caliphs.

Besides these translations we have numerous more or less original philosophical treatises written by Mohammedan Arabs, such as Ibn al Rabi, author of a treatise on *Politics*; Ibn Ishaq Al-Kindi, of Kufa, who is said to have written two hundred works on the most varied topics of philosophy; Ahmad al-Sarakhsi (A. D. 899); Al-Farabi (A. D. 950) who wrote about seventy volumes on logic, morals, politics, mathematics, alchemy, and music; and Ibn-Sina, better known as Avicenna, (980-1046) probably the greatest Arabian philosopher and theologian and a man of encyclopedic knowledge. Al-Muhashshir ibn Fatik (XI. century.); Ibn abi Randaqa, of Tortosa, (1059-1126), Avenpace of Saragossa, (A. D. 1138); Ibn Tufail, of Cadiz (A. D. 1185), and especially Ibn Rushd, known all over the West under the name of Averroes, of Cordova, (1126-1198) the greatest Arabian exponent of Aristotelic philosophy, and a man endowed with extraordinary talent and originality.

In the study of mathematics mention must be made of Al-Khawarizmi (from whose name our word "Logarithm" or "Algorithm" is derived) who was born in 820 and died in 901 A. D., and whose works on Algebra and Arithmetic were early translated from Arabic into Latin and studied in Europe; also the following: Thabit ibn Qurra; his son, Sinan (A. D. 942), and his grandson, Ibrahim (A. D. 946); Abu Bakr, of Karkh; Ibn al-Haitham; and 'Umar al-Khayyam, the great Persian poet (A. D. 1121) now known all over the English speaking world through Fitzgerald's free rendering of his famous "Ruba'iyyat," who wrote many mathematical and astronomical works in Arabic.

In the field of astronomy and Astrology the following names deserve mention; Abu Yusuf Ya 'qub al-Qarshi; Ahmad al-Farghani, Abu-Ma'shar Ja'far ibn Muhammad, better known as Albumaser, probably the greatest Arabian astronomer; Muhammad ibn Jabir al-Battani, famous all over medieval Europe under the name of Albategnius, from whose name "Jabir" our word "Algebra" is derived; and many others.

The Arabs of the Abbaside dynasty produced numerous and very valuable works on Geography, the knowledge of which they acquired mainly through long and extensive travels and observations all over

Asia, Africa, and parts of Europe. These works are exceedingly valuable, practically the only records we possess of the customs, climate, political vicissitudes, history, and social conditions of medieval Western Asia, India, China, Tartary, Persia, Syria, Egypt, Africa, and Moslem Europe. Many of these works have been lately edited in Europe by the indefatigable Arabic scholar, Prof. De Goeje, of Leyden, and others. The best known of these Arabic geographers and travellers are Ibn Khurdadbeh (A. D. 856); Al-Ya 'qubi; Abu Bakr ibn al-Faqih; Ibn Rosteh; Abu Zaid al-Balhki; Al-Hamadani; Abu Abdallah al-Maqdisi; Al-Biruni; Al-Bakri; Al-Idrisi; Al-Mazini; Ibn Jubair; Yaqut, the author of the famous *Goegraphical Dictionary*, which is said to be without a parallel in any other language; Ibn Hauqal; Abul-Fida; Abdul-Latif al-Baghdadi; Al-Qazwini; Al-Abdari; Ibn Battuta, and many others.

At the beginning of the Abbaside dynasty the greatest masters in the science of medicine were the Christian Nestorians, who were then constantly employed at the courts of the Caliphs as their personal medical attendants. Later on, the Arabs themselves applied their full energies to the mastery of medicine, and with considerable success. Among the Christian Nestorians it is sufficient to mention the well-known names of George Bokhtyisho and his son Gabriel; Abu l Hassan ibn Rabban, (of Jewish extraction); Yahya ibn Masawaih; Ishaq ibn Sulaiman, (of Jewish descent); 'Isa Ibn 'Ali Abu Sahl; 'Isa Ibn Yahya; Abu-l Faraj ibn al Tayyib; and Hassan ibn Botlan. Among the Mohammedans, Abdallah ibn Tumirt, Rhazes or al-Razi (the first of whom is said to have written five hundred works on medicine, the second, eighty); Ibn Ridwan; Abu Sa'id ibn Bokhtyisho, of the famous family mentioned above, but a Moslem convert from the Christian faith; Yahya ibn Jazla, of Christian parents but also a Mohammedan convert; Abul Salt 'umayya ibn Abdul-'Aziz; and finally, the famous Musa or Moses ibn Maimun, better known as Maimonides, the great Jewish philosopher of Cordova and author of the famous *Guide of the Perplexed*, written in Arabic. To these might be added several other scholars who wrote on Alchemy, Mineralogy, Botany, Zoology, Music, and other sciences, whose names for the lack of space must be omitted.

From the above meagre and very inadequate sketch of the history of Arabic learning during the Abbaside Dynasty, of five centuries' duration, the reader can easily perceive how, during these centuries when Europe was suffering from intellectual lethargy, the Arabs and the Moslem world at large were the great custodians and promoters of

science and learning and how to them we owe in large part the great intellectual revival of the thirteenth century of the Christian Era.

The third and last period of Arabic literature, which extends from the fall of Bagdad and the overthrow of the Abbaside Dynasty, by the Mongols, down to our own days, is a period of distinct decadence, although in it flourished some able and distinguished Arabic Savants and literateurs.

Among the poets we may mention Safi-ddin al-Hilli (1278-1351); Ibn Nubata (1278-1366); Ibn Hijja (1366-1434); Siraj al-din ibn Mas'ud, surnamed al-Majjan (A. D. 1301); Al-Saruji (1230-1294); Shams-al-din Al-Dahhan (A. D. 1321); Ibn Fadl-Allah Al-'Umari (1301-1348); Ibn al Murahhal (1267-1316); Ibn Zailaq (A. D. 1262); Al Kaiwani (A. D. 1623); Abdul-Ghani al Nabulusi (1641-1731); Ibn Ma'tuq (1614-1676), etc. The productions of all these poets are characterized, with few exceptions, by decadence both of thought and expression,

In the study of Grammar, lexicography and Arabic philology in general, the following names represent some of the most conspicuous authors: Ibn Mukarram, of Egyptian extraction, (1232-1311), who is said to have written five hundred works and who is well known as the author of a very extensive and scholarly dictionary of the Arabic language in 20 vols. entitled *Lisan-ul-'Arab* or "the language of the Arabs;" Ibn Ajurrum (A. D. 1324), author of the "Aljurumiyya," a grammatical treatise, noted for its brevity and conciseness; Ibn Hisham (1308-1360); Majd-al-din Al-Firuzabadi (1329-1414), the well known author of the famous Arabic dictionary called *Qamus* or "Ocean" and a standard authority on Arabic lexicography; Gabriel Ibn Farhat, a Maronite bishop of Aleppo, (1660-1732), and author of an Arabic Diwan, grammar and dictionary; and many other writers, who flourished in Iraq or Mesopotamia, and especially in Syria, Egypt, and the Berber States, such as Al-Watwat (1235-1318); Al-Abshihi (1338-1446); Al-Nawajji (1383-1455); Abdul Quadir Al-Baghdadi (A. D. 1682), the author of a very valuable work in four vols. entitled "Khizanat-al-Adab" or "Treasure of literature," etc., etc. Special mention must be made however of two scholars whose names and works are familiar to all Arabic students. The first is Jalal-al-d'n Al-Suyuti, an Arabic polygraph of marvellous erudition and learning and a distinguished grammarian, philologist, historian, Koranic exegete, theologian, and jurist. The other is Hajji Khalfa A. D. 1658), of Turkish descent, the author of a great and extremely

valuable encyclopedic and bibliographical dictionary of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish literatures, called *Kashf-al-dunun* or "The Clearing up of Doubt," first edited with a Latin translation, by Gustavus Flügel, in 8 large vols. in folio, under the title of *Lexicon Bibliographicum*, etc. Among the historians and writers of this third period may be mentioned Ibn-al-Tiqtaqa (XIII century), the author of a valuable history of the Moslem empire; Ahmad-al-Ghabrini, the Berber, (1246-1314); Abul Hassan ibn Abi Zar', of Grenada, who wrote a history of the kings of Maghrib; Ibn Taimiyya, of Harran in Mesopotamia, (1236-1328), a very prolific writer and historian and author of over fifty works; Abul-Barakat al Nasafi (A. D. 1310), a traditionalist and theologian of great reputation; Rashid-al-din of Hamadan, of Jewish descent, (1247-1318), author of a famous history of the Mongols; Abul-Fida, the great historian and geographer (1273-1331); Abul-Abbas al-Nuwairi (1282-1332), a distinguished lawyer and historian; Shams al Din, of Damascus, (1254-1327) the author of a valuable *Cosmography*; Abu Hayyan, the Berber, (1256-1345), who wrote a number of books in Arabic, Turkish, Persian, and Ethiopic; Shams-al-din Al Dhahabi (1274-1348), the author of a useful history of Islam; Zain al-din Ibn al-Wadi (1290-1349); Ibn Shabir Al-Kutubi, or the "Bookseller," (A. D. 1363), of Alleppo, who wrote a Chronicle of the Caliphs and of the learned men of Islam and a supplement to Ibn Khallikan's *Biographical Dictionary;* Khalil Ibn Aibak-al-Safadi (A. D. 1363), who wrote a biographical dictionary in 26 volumes and many other books of the most varied character and contents; Ibn Kathir (1302-1372); Lisan al-Din Al-Khatib (1313-1374), who wrote a history of the Mameluke Sultans of Egypt; Ibn al Furat, of Cairo, (1334-1405), a jurist and historian, who wrote a history of the Moslem Dynasties in 15 vols.; Sharaf-al-din ibn-al-Muqri, of Yemen in Arabia, (1354-1433); and especially Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406), one of the greatest philosopher-historians, sociologists, and men of letters of Islam. His *History* and especially the *Prolegomena* which he appended to it, is a masterpiece of a philosophy of History, written after the most approved critical method of modern history-writing. Other historians and writers of the period are Abul-Khair Ibn al-Jazari (1350-1429); the great Persian poet Jami (1414-1492), who wrote thirteen Arabic works on theological subjects; Ibn Duqmaq (1350-1406), the author of a history of Islam in 12 vols. and a history of Egypt; Shihab-al Din al Qalqashandi (A. D. 1418); Taqi-al-Din Al Fasi (1373-1429), the author of a topographical and historical description of Mecca; the famous Al-Maqrisi

(1356-1442), the author of a history of the Copts, a history of the Fatimite Caliphs, of the Mameluke Sultans of Egypt, of the fall of the Omayyads and the beginnings of the Abbaside Dynasty, and of an immense biographical dictionary in eighty Volumes; Ibn al-Arabshah (1389-1450), of Damascus, the author of a history of Tamerlane and of the Mongols, etc., etc. A most interesting literary production of this and the preceding period of Arabic literature is that strange and liveliest of all story-collections of ancient and modern times, the *Thousand and One Nights* or *Arabian Nights*, so familiar to all European and especially English readers, through many versions and translations.

The history of Arabic literature in the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth is that of a healthy revival full of promise and expectation. All over the Mohammadan world, but especially in Syria and Egypt, this revival has assumed gigantic proportions. In these two last mentioned countries Arabic erudition and learning is almost entirely in the hands of Christian Scholars, who have been busily engaged in founding new colleges and schools, printing houses, and libraries, in editing the old Arabic classics, and in establishing numerous daily, weekly, and monthly publications. The most illustrious Arabic literateurs of the XIXth and XXth centuries are Christians, and, to a great extent, clergymen belonging to the Maronite, Syriac, Chaldean, Armenian, and Greek Churches. Special mention however should be made of the indefatigable energy and zeal of the Jesuit Fathers of Beyrout, Syria, who have there a very flourishing university with library and printing offices whence are issued a semi-weekly newspaper, and a bi-monthly scientific and literary periodical called *Al-Mashriq* or "The Orient." Among the Mohammedans, the centre of Arabic learning is Cairo, where the famous Mosque and school of "Al'-Azhar," probably the oldest among existing universities, was founded in the IXth century A. D., Even at the present day this school is frequented by over three thousand students from all over the Mohammedan world.

Also in India, Mesopotamia, and the Berber States, Arabic studies are contsantly developing and increasing. But the greatest impulse towards the revival of Arabic studies has come from Europe, where in all the most important Universities, special chairs for Arabic studies have been founded and fully equipped. There also we find several scientific periodicals entirely or partly devoted to the advancement of Arabic studies and researches. It is also through the untiring patience and deep scholarship of European savants that hundreds of the most valuable Arabic classics, including poetry, grammars, philology, history,

theology, philosophy, Koranic exegesis, etc., etc., have been published in critical editions and in part translated. The palm of honor unmistakably belongs to Germany and France, though Holland, Italy, and England, have undoubtedly produced some of our foremost modern Arabic Scholars and Orientalists. In America the increasing interest in Arabic and Oriental studies in general is also rapidly progressing, and in our principal Universities, such as Yale, Harvard, Columbia, Chicago, California, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Johns Hopkins', etc. we have special chairs of Arabic professorships, well organized and fully equipped.

GABRIEL OUSSANI.

PHILO AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

G. S. Hitchcock, S. J.

At Alexandria, among the many Hellenists, Jews who spoke Greek, allegorical interpretation reigned; and in Philo, it found a spirit eager to extend its dominion. Born about a quarter of a century before the Christian era (*L. C.* 1 *and* 28), and winning literary renown while our Lord was forming the Mystery of His Own Hidden Life, Philo took the Sacred Books of his nation, just as he found them in their Old Greek dress, and made Moses and the Prophets foretell the problems, mystic and moral, of the Platonic schools. In his works, there are fourteen references to the Day of Atonement, and some of these occur in such contexts as to suggest that the Solemn Fast was very familiar to his mind.

In one passage (*S. and F.* 23), he accounts for the ordinance as providing training in self-control, opportunity for prayer and a fitting prelude to the autumn harvest. He labours to explain why it was held on the tenth day, and will have it that as ten includes all the proportions, arithmetical, harmonic and geometrical, Moses intended to show hunger is not necessarily an evil, but an ally to the reasoning power, which becomes so strengthened by the body's fast, it can march without stumbling towards that worth seeing and hearing.

Because of the virtue inherent in lowliness, Philo held that the Day of Expiation and Atonement was arranged to fall according to the perfect number of the decade (*P. C.* 13). Therefore on the tenth day, souls should humble themselves; and by renouncing pride, they would work the pardon of their unjust deeds, whether these were voluntary or involuntary. Hellenising still more daringly in blending Mosaic tradition and Platonic speculation (*C. E. G.* 19), he speaks of the Expiation as made on the tenth of the month, because then the soul made its supplication to the tenth God, not to those gods who rule the nine spheres of created existence, whether the earth or the seven planets or the firmament itself, but to Him Who never came into being, because He ever is.

As to the fasting (*L. A. III.* 61.), the Expiation is by affliction that God may prove propitious; and for this the Eternal Himself

provides the hunger, which Philo transforms by allegory into abstinence from passion and vice. Then the soul imitates Moses in pitching its tent beyond the camp of all that is material, and begins to worship God, even entering the darkness and the invisible sanctuary, where it may abide in most holy achievements. Yet it was but once a year, the highpriest entered within the veil; and hardly once a year is the highpriest in the human soul, its Word or Reason, authorised to occupy itself with the holy decrees (*G.II.*).

Then in the changing of the priestly raiment, and in the laying aside of the splendid robe, which fell about the feet, Philo beheld the soul putting off its vestment of opinion and imagination, leaving that to such as love external things and honour mere opinion as though it were the truth. For to him, the clothing represented the parts or powers of the irrational nature, which sometimes overshadowed the rational (*L. A. II.* 15).

But it must be remembered that the great Jewish dreamer held the earthly tabernacle for a symbol of two temples, of which one is the universe, and there the Divine Word, God's Firstborn, is highpriest, and the other is the rational soul, in which what is truly man is priest. Entering within the latter, and abandoning the material order with all that speaks of it, he lives in the most Holy Place of pure intelligence, pouring out the soul's blood in libation and burning the whole intelligence as incense to the Saviour and beneficient God (*L. A. II.* 15) Therefore the highpriest was vested in white linen, bright and clean, the symbol of activity and incorruption (*S. I.* 37). And this was intended as an indication that those,who would serve the Self-Existent, must first use strength of mind to spurn all human things, for these allure and injure and enfeeble.

But in that scorn of earth and in that ambition to live as a pure intelligence, there breathed the spirit of Platonism, and Philo hesitates on the brink of its Pantheism. We ask him what becomes of the soul, when it has entered the Most Holy Place, and in three different passages, he gives us three different answers, but all founded on a misreading of his Greek translation. Taking the words of the Hebrew text one by one, we read that "every man shall not be in the tent," when the priest enters; and the Hebrew idiom implies that "no man shall be" there. Philo's Old Greek or Septuagint version translated the Hebrew sentence word by word. And Philo, omitting the first word "every," understood the passage to mean that the highpriest "shall not be man" when he enters.

Therefore, he says that the intellect, when it offers God the pure service of worship is not human but divine (*Q. R. D. H.* 16) If it then turns to anything human, it descends from heaven, or rather, fallen to earth, it comes forth from the Most Holy Place.

Yet elsewhere (*S. II.* 28.) he hesitates to assert plainly such deification of the intellect in its communion with God. The reason, he would have it, is belittled in association with the other parts or powers of the human soul, though it be the president of these, and the only one that can call them into council. But none the less, although it be alone, reason is sufficient for all speculation and action, itself a whole judgment-place, a whole council-hall, a whole people, a whole multitude, all the race of men in one. And having so chanted its resources, he urges it is a nature on the limit line between God and man, inferior indeed to God, but superior to man. Growing bolder, he says that the highpriest, entering the Most Holy Place, shall not be man. Who then, he asks, if not man? Is he then indeed God? Philo declines to say, but contents himself with reminding us that the lot of this name fell to the archprophet Moses, when he was yet in Egypt, and was addressed as Pharao's God.

But a little later (*S. II.* 34), he resumes the question, and tells us the beautiful limit line for the soul is to be neither God nor man, but to touch both extremes, the humanity of a mortal race and the virtue of the Immortal. And turning for a comparison to "the oracular utterance concerning the great priest," he repeats the passage for the third time, still misreading it. When the high priest enters the Holy of Holies, Philo misquotes, "he shall not be man until he come out." Then he argues that if the highpriest becomes one who is not a man, it is clear that neither is he God, but God's minister, one who offers Him the public service of worship, in regard to what is mortal dwelling in the world of change, but in regard to what is immortal, dwelling with the Uncreated.

Thus, the just man, regarded as an individual apart from the sacred nation of Israel's children, and apart from the consecrated tribe of Levi's sons, may pass into the Most Holy Place, when that is understood as the world of pure intellect, and then he will occupy the middle rank between the Creator and the created. The same idea is present to Philo, when he would explain the two lots in the ritual (*P.* 14). One of these was for God the Lord, Who is the Self-Existent, never coming into being, because He ever is. And the other was for that sent away, the world of creatures, that come into being and are subject to

the dominion of change in the realm of birth and death. He then, who venerates the Primal Cause of all things, obtains honour as his lot. But he who venerates the created shall be put to flight, driven from the most sacred places, fall upon regions pathless and profane, and meet at the end deep pits of ruin.

In another passage also (*Q. R. D. H.* 37), Philo reads the same meaning into the casting of the lot, which he describes as a divider, neither visible nor evident, yet separating the two goats. For of the two persons implied, he who busies himself in all that concerns Divine virtue, is consecrated and offered to God the Creator. But the other, studious of what regards human illfortune, is delivered to the created world, that flees away.

The veneration of the Eternal is intimately connected with the life of God (*P. C.* 20). And because God is the fount of reason, he, whose mode of living is irrational, must be separated as by a cord from the life of God. But Moses (*Dt. XXX.* 20), for so Philo quotes him, had said that it is our life to love Him Who is; and therefore to live according to God consists in loving Him. As to the opposite mode of living, an example is laid before us in the case of the goat, over which the expiation was to be made.

Then again, the lots are explained as representing the world of intellect and that of sense (*L. A. II.* 14). On the one side is God, the Father of the Universe, and God's Virtue and Wisdom, the mother of all things. But the intellect, leaving these to wed the world of sense, becomes one flesh with it; and in choosing its life of feeling and passion, becomes like the goat sent away.

So Philo translated the Day of Atonement into questions of knowledge and virtue, but these in regard to the individual soul only. This was the easier for Alexandrian Hellenists, Jews who thought Moses and spoke Greek, because they lived apart from the sacred places of their nation, knew their sacred books in a Greek translation, and neighboured those who spoke Greek and thought Plato.

G. S. Hitchcock, S. J.

STUDIES

DIVORCE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

AN EXEGETICAL STUDY. (IV)

Francis E. Gigot, D. D.

As we saw in our last paper, I Cor. vii, 10, 11 states and enforces as the command of "the Lord," the same absolute injunction against divorce as is ascribed to Christ in Mk. x, 2-12 and Lk. xvi, 18. Its plain and direct meaning is to the effect that neither husband nor wife is allowed to break the bond of holy matrimony, and therefore rules out any and every cause that would justify remarriage after divorce. In it St. Paul placing husband and wife exactly on the same footing with regard to the marriage tie, supposes that a wife has actually separated herself in a permanent manner from her husband, and declares that she may not lead a married life unless she goes back to the one who is still "the husband." Whence it is clear that according to the Apostle's mind, the marriage bond remains intact despite a permanent separation; and several Protestant scholars, truly unbiassed by dogmatic preoccupation, have of late expressly recognized that in this passage St. Paul proclaims in virtue of the Lord's command, the indissolubility of the marriage tie between two Christians. This interpretation of I Cor. vii, 10, 11 appears all the more unquestionable because it is the only one which tallies with the context, and with other passages in St. Paul's Epistles. It is the only one in harmony with those passages wherein the Apostle distinctly states that the marriage tie binds a wife until her husband's death, condemns her remarriage before that event as an adultery (Cf. I. vii, 2, 3; Rom. vii, 2, 3), and describes the marriage relation between a Christian husband and a Christian wife as making them "one flesh," as obliging them to strict and permanent duties for its preservation, and as binding them to a union which is a copy of the very union which exists between Christ and His Church (Eph. v, 22-33). It is also the only one in harmony with the context of I Cor. vii, 10, 11, for this context proves that in wording I Cor. vii, 10, 11, St. Paul represented as indissoluble the

union of "the married" whom he had in view, simply because he applied to them the command of "the Lord." In examining this context in our preceding paper, we indeed assumed, rather than proved, the dissolubility of a marriage which, according to the Apostle's mind, did not fall under the law of Christ; but we then promised soon to discuss this point in detail, and it is to redeem our promise that we shall make in the present paper a close study of the "Pauline Privilege" set forth in I Cor. vii, 12-16.

The following is a direct rendering of this important passage, from the original Greek:

I Cor. vii.

12. But to the rest say I, not the Lord:
If any brother has a non-believing wife
and she consents to dwell with him,
let him not dismiss her.
13. And if any wife has a non-believing husband
and he consents to dwell with her,
let her not dismiss him.
14. For the non-believing husband is hallowed in the wife,
and the non-believing wife is hallowed in the brother:
else were your children unclean; but now they are holy.
15. But if the non-believing [consort] departs,
let him depart.
The brother or the sister is not enslaved in such [cases],
but God has called us in peace.
16. For how knowest thou, O wife,
whether thou shalt save the husband?
or how knowest thou, O husband,
whether thou shalt save the wife?

In this passage, as in I Cor. vii, 10, 11, we can readily notice three several elements, the precise meaning of which it behooves us to determine accurately. The first consists in the short introductory phrase: "But to the rest say I, not the Lord," which sets forth St. Paul's exact purpose in writing the passage: the Apostle wishes to give to a class of the Corinthian faithful, directions of his own concerning their married state. The second element extends to the end of verse 14:

I Cor. vii.

12b If any brother has a non-believing wife
and she consents to dwell with him,
let him not dismiss her.
13. And if any wife has a non-believing husband
and he consents to dwell with her,
let her not dismiss him.
14. For the non-believing husband is hallowed in the wife,
and the non-believing wife is hallowed in the brother:
else were your children unclean; but now they are holy.

It deals with the case of mixed marriages wherein the non-Christian partner is willing to remain in marriage relation with the Christian consort. It gives and justifies the Apostle's decision that, in such a case, the Christian should continue the marriage intercourse. In the third and last element of the passage—the last two verses—St. Paul treats of a precisely opposite kind of mixed marriages, viz.: that in which the non-Christian partner chooses to break off the marriage relation with the Christian party. As in the foregoing element, the Apostle gives and justifies the line of conduct which the Christian partner should follow:

I Cor. vii.

15. But if the non-believing [consort] departs,
let him depart.
The brother or the sister is not enslaved in such [cases],
but God has called us in peace.
16. For how knowest thou, O wife,
whether thou shalt save the husband?
or how knowest thou, O husband,
whether thou shalt save the wife?

Of these three elements, the first: "But to the rest say I, not the Lord," is of a special importance because of its manifest bearing on the whole passage. It points out, in the first place, the particular class of the Corinthian Christians to whom St. Paul intends to give the directions that follow: "But to the rest;" and next, the exact authority to which he refers these directions: "Say I, not the Lord." The expression: τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς "but to the rest," which he places at the beginning of the sentence, recalls forcibly by its position and its construction the words which he has used at the beginning of the two preceding sections, in the first of which (verses 8, 9), he speaks of the non-married Corinthian Christians by means of the expression: τοῖς ἀγάμοις καὶ ταῖς χήραις "to the unmarried and to the widows;" and in the second of which (verses 9, 10), he addresses the married Corinthians, both of whom were Christians, by means of the formula: τοῖς δὲ γεγαμηκόσιν "but to the married:"

I Cor. vii.

8a But I say *to the unmarried* and *to the widows*...
10a But *to the married* I command, not I, but the Lord...
12a But *to the rest* say I, not the Lord....

The striking parallelism which exists between the opening formula: "but to the rest," and the two preceding ones, is manifestly intentional on St. Paul's part. As he has employed the first two formulas to introduce each time a distinct class of the Corinthian Christians to

whom he wished to give appropriate directions with regard to the married state, so he now uses the third parallel formula to introduce another distinct class of the Corinthian faithful to whom he intends to impart special directions concerning the same state in life. The Christians whom he has now in view are those "brothers" and "sisters" of whom he speaks in the body of I Cor. vii, 12-16 as united in marriage to a "non-believing," that is, non-Christian, consort.[1] Such married Christians stand before his mind as clearly distinct from both the unmarried of whom he has treated in verses 8, 9, and "the married" (both of whom were Christians) to whom he has just given directions in verses 10, 11, for they are living in what may conveniently be called *mixed marriage*.[2] He therefore conceives of them as forming a special class by themselves, and this he denotes by the use of the adversative particle δὲ "*but* to the rest." He no less clearly realizes that such a third class of Christians includes all the remainder of the faithful needing directions with regard to the married state, and in consequence, he rightly designates it by means of the expression τοῖς λοιποῖς "the rest."

A further study of the three opening expressions in I Cor. vii, 8, 10, 12:

> 8. to the unmarried and to the widows...
> 10. But to the unmarried...
> 12. But to the rest...,

enables us to realize more definitely the extent to which, according to St. Paul's mind, Christians united to a non-Christian consort form a distinct class. As can readily be seen, the Apostle establishes the same distinction between Christians united to a non-Christian consort, and two married Christians, as between the latter and "the unmarried and the widows." As he has set forth the contrast which he has in view between the married (verse 10) and those not actually living in marriage (verse 8), by means of the expression: τοῖς δὲ γεγαμηκόσι

[1]As in this section (I Cor. vii, 12-16), St. Paul has not a single word of blame for the faithful united in marriage to a non-Christian partner, it is universally, and indeed rightly, admitted, that he is dealing here only with marriages contracted by two parties when as yet non-Christian, and transformed into, so to speak, *mixed* marriages by the subsequent conversion of either husband or wife to Christianity. Contrast with I Cor. vii, 12-16, the strong rebuke of Christians becoming yoked with unbelievers, which is found in II Cor. vi, 14 sqq.

[2]For the sake of convenience we will apply ,throughout this paper, the term "mixed" to such marriages between a non-Christian and a Christian partner, although the term is now restricted in theology to designate marriages between a Catholic and a baptized non-Catholic.

"*but to the married*," so immediately afterwards he sets forth the contrast which he admits between two married Christians on the one hand, and Christians married to a non-Christian partner, on the other, by means of an exactly parallel expression: τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς "*but to the rest.*" It thus appears that on account of their actual condition in the married state, Christians united to a non-Christian consort are considered by the Apostle as forming a class no less apart from that of "the married" both of whom were Christians, than is the latter from the one which comprises "the unmarried and the widows." And this is an important conclusion inasmuch as it naturally leads us to admit that the directions which he intends to give to "the rest" of the Corinthian faithful, are viewed by him as essentially no less different from those which he has just given to "the married," than the latter are from the directions already imparted to Christians not actually living in the married state.

That in taking this last position we are not ascribing to St. Paul a view of the matter that would be foreign to his mind, is proved by the fact that to the opening expression: "but to the rest," he subjoins at once the significant words: λέγω ἐγώ‘ουχ ὁΚύριος "Say I, not the Lord." Obviously, these additional words are intimately connected with the formulas: λέγω δὲ ("but I say"), and: παραγγελλω,οὐκ ἐγὼ‘ἀλλὰ ὁ Κύριος ("I command, not I, but the Lord"), which the Apostle has used at the beginning of the two preceding sections, respectively;:

I Cor. vii.

8a But *I say* to the unmarried and the widows...
10a But to the married *I command, not I, but the Lord*...
12a But to the rest *say I, not the Lord*....

It is plain, for instance, that the words: "say I, not the Lord," are, like the preceding formulas, intended to point out the exact authority to which the Apostle refers the directions which he is about to impart to those whom he has in view. No less plain is it, that in writing: "say I, not the Lord," he has deliberately used words which he had already employed in framing the preceding formulas. When these two things are distinctly borne in mind, the precise wording of the phrase: "say I, not the Lord," becomes highly significant. It discloses the fact that St. Paul places "the rest" though actually living in the marriage state, on practically the same basis as "the unmarried and the widows" spoken of in verses 8, 9. It is on that account that in verse 12, he has set aside the verb παραγγέλλω "I command," of verse 10, to return

to the verb λέγω "I say," of verse 8. It is on that account too, that he considers as not applying to the marriage tie of "the rest" the Lord's command which he has proclaimed with regard to "the married," both of whom were Christians. Had he viewed the marriage tie as equally binding in both cases, he would not have treated Christians living in mixed marriages as a class different from that of two married Christians, or at least he would not have explicitly denied that the command of "the Lord" applied to them, and would not have written: "Say I, not the Lord." It therefore appears that the Apostle considers the marriage tie which exists between a Christian and a non-Christian consort as essentially different from the one which binds two married Christians. He uses the formula: "Say I, not the Lord," because he knows that Christ's authority has not made such mixed marriages indissoluble, and that it depends on his own apostolic authority,—exactly as in the case of "the unmarried and the widows," —to frame the rules to be complied with in regard to the married state by Christians who are not actually bound by an indissoluble union.

The foregoing interpretation of the clause: "But to the rest say I, not the Lord," wherewith St. Paul prefaces his directions to Christians married to a non-Christian partner, is powerfully confirmed by its thorough harmony with the manner in which he treats in the very next element of I Cor. vii, 12-16, the binding force of the mixed marriages he has actually in view. This second element runs as follows:

I Cor. vii.

12b If any brother has a non-believing wife
and she consents to dwell with him,
let him not dismiss her.
13. And if any wife has a non-believing husband[3]
and he consents to dwell with her,
let her not dismiss him.
14. For the non-believing husband is hallowed in the wife,
and the non-believing wife is hallowed in the brother:
else were your children unclean; but now they are holy.

The best and indeed, the only proper, way, to realize the full meaning of these lines, is to go back in thought to the time when they were written, and to compare their tenor with the Jewish regulations of that day concerning marriages similar to those of which the Apostle treats here. In St. Paul's time, there were, of course, numerous cases

[3]We have adopted this rendering of verse 13a because it undoubtedly sets forth St. Paul's mind, whichever of the two Greek readings: καὶ γυνὴ ἔι τις ἔχει, καὶ γυνὴ ἥτις ἔχει be considered as primitive. For the authorities in favor of either reading, see R. Cornely, S. J., *Prior Epistola ad Corinthios*, p. 175.

where marriages contracted by two Jews had been transformed iton mixed unions, by the passage of one of the consorts to a different worship. In such cases, the Jewish authorities naturally considered that it was within their province to decide what was the obligation incumbent upon the sole remaining believer with rgeard to the marriage relation, and they actually bound him to divorce the non-believing consort.[4] According to them, this obligation was equally binding on the believing husband and the believing wife, for the simple reason that neither of them could continue the marriage intercourse without incurring a defilement[5] that would henceforth make their children "unclean" from "holy," as they were reputed before.

Now, whoever studies the lines above quoted (I Cor. vii, 12c-14), in the light of these historical circumstances of St. Paul's time, will find it easy to understand both his decision and the reason he gives therefor. The Apostle has distinctly before his mind marriages contracted by two non-Christian parties, and transformed into mixed unions by the subsequent conversion of only one of the consorts. In virtue of his own authority, he professes to formulate a rule relative to the marriage tie only for the now Christian partner, who alone, as he knows full well, falls under his jurisdiction,[6] just as the Jewish authorities legislated in regard to mixed marriages, only for the partner who remained under their control. He addresses his rule equally to both the believing husband and the believing wife,exactly as the Jewish authorities applied their decision to both the one and the other. But while these Jewish authorities forbade the continuance of the marriage intercourse after one of the Jewish partners had embraced a different religion, he expressly declares that this intercourse must be kept up by the one who has been converted to Christianity, if the non-believing consort is willing to continue the marriage relation. He is fully aware that he thereby departs from the Jewish regulations then in vigor, and this is why after formulating his own rule:

[4]Cf. A. Edersheim (*Sketches of Jewish Life in the Days of Christ*, p. 158) who states positively: "One of the cases in which divorce was obligatory was, if either party had become heretical, or ceased to profess Judaism." Such a regulation was in thorough harmony with the extreme measures of Nehemias (xiii, 23-31) and Esdras (ix, x) to preserve the purity of the Jewish blood.

[5]In New Testament times, even the passing intercourse of a Jew with a Gentile was universally regarded as defiling (Cf. Acts x, 14, 15, 28; xi, 3 sqq.; etc.)

[6]This is evident from St. Paul's statement in I Cor. v, 12, 13: "What have I to do with judging those that are without....But those that are without, God judges."

I Cor. vii.

12b If any brother has a non-believing wife
and she consents to dwell with him,
let him not dismiss her.
13. And if any wife has a non-believing husband
and he consents to dwell with her,
let her not dismiss him,

he adds a once a reason that will justify his decision:

I Cor. vii.

14. For the non-believing husband is hallowed in the wife,
and the non-believing wife is hallowed in the brother:
else were your children unclean; but now they are holy.

This reason may be briefly explained as follows: In a marriage contracted by two Jewish parties, the change of religion on the part of one of them, naturally meant in the eyes of the Jews at large, the doing away with the sacred character of that partner, and therefore the diminishing of the holiness of the union and of its future progeny: the children born after the marriage had thus become mixed were considered not as "holy," but as "unclean." On this account, the Jewish authorities described the consort who had remained faithful to Judaism as defiled by all subsequent marriage intercourse with the partner who had passed to a different religion, and they obliged him to break the marriage tie. But it was the very reverse which took place, according to St. Paul, when out of two non-Christians united in marriage, one embraced Christianity. The change of religion was then a lifting up, a hallowing of the partner who had become a convert; it was an accretion of holiness for the union which when persevered in by the Christian consort did not defile, but sanctified the children; these would have been regarded as "unclean," had they been born before the marriage had become mixed; "but now they are holy." In view of this, the Apostle represented the non-believing party as "hallowed" by marriage intercourse with the Christian consort, and bade the latter to continue the marriage relation if the former still agreed to cohabit.

It thus appears that while St. Paul utilized the existing legislation of the Jews in framing his own rule relative to mixed marriages, he materially modified its enactment. He clearly saw that it behooved him thus to modify it since the introduction of Christianity into the world so profoundly changed the character of mixed marriages, that it ennobled the union, instead of being detrimental to it, after one of the consorts had become a Christian. At the same time, he no less clearly saw that, although made holier by the reception of Christianity

by one of the partners, the matrimonial union was not thereby rendered indissoluble. He indeed forbade the Christian consort to conform to the existing legislation of the Jews, and to break the marriage tie, but this he did not forbid absolutely, for his prohibition is expressly conditioned by the willingness of the non-Christian partner to continue to cohabit:

I Cor. vii.

12b *If* any brother has a non-believing wife
and she consents to dwell with him,
let him not dismiss her.
13. And *if* any wife has a non-believing husband
and he consents to dwell with her,
let her not dismiss him.

Had he regarded such marriage bond as indissoluble, he would naturally have represented the obligation of maintaining it, as he had done in quoting and applying the command of "the Lord" to two married Christians, in the immediately preceding verses (I Cor. vii, 10, 11). Instead of this, he distinctly makes that obligation subordinate to the continuance of the will of one of the partners, and indeed of the one who, as a non-Christian, evidently looked upon the marriage tie as dissoluble. It is plain therefore that in writing I Cor. vii, 12b-14, the Apostle treated the marriage he had in view, as a simple contract, which one of the parties, might either give up, or, on the contrary, ratify, because the other party had materially altered his condition in relation to it, and the binding force of which persevered only when the latter alternative was actually realized.

That such was St. Paul's real frame of mind in forbidding the Christian consort to divorce the non-Christian partner, is further confirmed by a careful study of the third element of I Cor. vii, 15-16. This third element may be rendered as follows:

I Cor. vii.

15. But if the non-believing [consort] departs,
let him depart.
The brother or sister is not enslaved in such [cases],
but God has called us in peace.
16. For how knowest thou, O wife,
whether thou shalt save the husband?
or how knowest thou, O husband,
whether thou shalt save the wife?

In these verses, the Apostle manifestly deals with the case where the non-believing consort wants to give up the contract. His purpose is to set forth the Christian partner's exact obligation in such a con-

tingency, and thereby to complete his decision "to the rest," that is, to Christians living in mixed marriages. In the opening line, he concisely states the case which he has now in view. He supposes (εἰ "if") that the non-Christian partner, upon whom he still makes the whole future of the marriage relation to depend, is this time in an entirely opposite frame of mind (hence the use of the adversative particle δὲ "but"), to the one in which he has represented him in the preceding lines (I Cor. vii, 12c-14). Instead of supposing that the non-believing consort accedes to the Christian's wish to continue to cohabit, the Apostle now conceives of him as having made up his mind to end the marriage intercourse: "But if the non-believing [consort] *departs*." It is not a mere withdrawal that would leave the marriage bond intact, that he has before his mind when he supposes that the non-Christian party withdraws, for he is writing, as we have seen in interpreting the immediately preceding lines (I Cor. vii, 12c-14), in distinct view of the Jewish obligation of divorcing in mixed marriages; and in consequence, he denotes the non-believing consort's practical refusal to cohabit by means of the verb χωρίζειν, a legal term implying the breaking of the marriage tie.[7]

Having thus briefly given the state of the case, St. Paul subjoins at once its solution. The gist of his decision is contained in one single word: the highly significant verb χωριζέσθω "let him depart." This verb is, of course, directed to the Christian with whose line of action regarding the married state the Apostle is concerned throughout this section. It is the very verb which has just been used in the statement of the case: "but if the non-believing departs" (χωρίζεται), to denote the breaking of the marriage tie, so that it has manifestly the same general meaning in St. Paul's mind when he writes: χωριζέσθω "let him depart." Its peculiar form here is a permissive imperative (χωριζέσθω), which conveys the special idea that the non-Christian partner *may* carry out his intention of doing away with all marriage obligation, and that the Christian consort cannot and ought not hinder him from doing so.[8] Whence it appears that in writing: "let him depart," the Apostle regards the union between two non-Christians as a breakable contract, and the non-believing partner as having the right actually to break it after its primitive condition has been materially changed by

[7]The meaning of Χωρίζειν has been examined in our preceding paper. (THE NEW YORK REVIEW, May-June, 1907).

[8]Cf. G. B. Winer, *A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament*, 7th edit., p. 310 sq.; Engl. Transl. edited by J. Henry Thayer, Andover, 1877.

the conversion of the other party. But this does not exhaust the meaning of the expression: "let him depart." The simple use of that verb here, implies moreover, that the Apostle considers the Christian consort as not bound to remain unmarried after the departure of the non-believing partner. Had St. Paul thought differently of the case, he would naturally have added some clause to make his mind clear in that regard, as he had actually done in the preceding section (I Cor. vii, 10, 11), where he explicitly bade the wife to remain unmarried (*μενέτο ἄγαμος*) after she was separated from her husband;[9] nay more, it would have behooved him to insert some such clause, since at the beginning of the present section he had expressly stated that the command of "the Lord" forbidding remarriage did not apply to such mixed unions: "But to the rest say I, not the Lord," and since in virtue of the universally-received notions of the day concerning divorce, the Christian's remarriage would naturally be regarded as lawful after he or she had been forsaken by the other partner.

In pursuance of his object of setting forth the Christian's obligation with regard to the married state when the non-believing partner wants to break the marriage tie, the Apostle completes and justifies in the remainder of the section, his brief decision: "let him depart." Literally rendered, this remainder runs as follows:

I Cor. vii.

15c Not enslaved is the brother or the sister in such [cases],
but in peace God has called us.
16. For how knowest thou, O wife,
whether thou shalt save the husband?
or how knowest thou, O husband,
whether thou shalt save the wife?

In writing these lines, St. Paul has plainly before his mind a Christian consort who is indeed aware of the refusal of the other partner to cohabit, but who has not yet been deserted.[10] He conceives of him as inclined not to allow the departure of the non-believing partner, and he suggests the reasons for which the Christian consort should come to the resolve prescribed by the decision: "let him depart." He clearly sees that the contract which he has represented in the pre-

[9]Cf. Willibald Beyschlag, *New Testament Theology*, vol. ii, p. 220. Engl. Transl. Edinburgh, T. T. Clark, 1899.

[10]In verse 16, for instance, St. Paul speaks of the Christian consort as entertaining some hope of the conversion of the non-believing partner, should he prevail upon him not to depart; again, the expression "in such cases" in verse 15c, refers back to 15a: "But if the non-believing departs" wherein the present tense *χωρίζεται* excludes the actual departure of the non-Christian.

ceding case (verses 12b-14) as binding on the Christian partner because ratified by the non-believing party, should not be considered as binding ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις "in such cases" as the present, where this ratification is actually refused. No less clearly does he realize that should the Christian persevere in feeling bound to the non-believing partner who now denies marriage rights "the brother" or "the sister" would thereby be reduced to the condition of a slave with duties, without corresponding rights, in relation to a master. He therefore emphatically declares: "Not enslaved is the brother or sister in such [cases]," thereby assuring the Christian that on the score of the past marriage contract, there is no reason why he should not abide by the apostolic decision: "let him depart." This done, St. Paul proceeds a step farther towards the object which he has in view. Over against the supposed, but unreal marriage obligation on the part of the believing partner, he distinctly sets the universal and ever-binding obligation of Christians to live in peace: "But in peace God has called us." According to his mind, this is an unquestionable and urgent duty which should cause "the brother" or "the sister" to set aside not only all vain fear with regard to the past: "Not enslaved is the brother or the sister in such [cases],"but also all illusory hope concerning the future:

I Cor. vii.

16. For how knowest thou, O wife,
whether thou shalt save the husband?
or how knowest thou, O husband,
whether thou shalt save the wife?

Plainly, the Christian consort could not reasonably expect anything like peace from the non-believing party who had made up his mind to sever the marriage tie, still less could he or she reasonably anticipate to win him over to Christianity. In consequence, the only wise line of action to be followed is the one prescribed by the Apostle: "let him depart."

The following are the principal conclusions borne out by our study of I Cor. vii, 12-16. First of all, it cannot be doubted that when the passage is carefully examined in the light of the circumstances of the day, and its every word is taken in a natural sense," the Pauline Privilege" is seen to allow the remarriage of a Christian, only if the non-believing partner does not wish to abide by the primitive marriage contract. In the second place, in allowing this, St. Paul is fully conscious that he does not go against the Lord's command, for he distinctly realizes and states that those for whom he so legislates, do

not fall under that command of "the Lord." As well said by a leading Protestant commentator: "The Apostle expressly asserts, verse 12, that *Our Lord's words do not apply* to such marriages as are here contemplated. They were spoken to those *within the covenant*, and as such apply immediately to the wedlock of Christians (verse 10), but *not to mixed marriages*."[11] Again, in framing his decision, the Apostle utilizes indeed the existing Jewish legislation with regard to marriages similar to those which he has in view, but he also modifies it to the extent required by the introduction of Christianity into the world. According to him, when a non-believing consort becomes a Christian he has no self-profanation to fear from a continuance of marriage intercourse with the one who remains unconverted, and in consequence, St. Paul bids the now Christian partner to abide by the marriage contract, if the still non-believing party is willing to cohabit. Lastly, the apostolic decision contained in I Cor. vii, 12-16, once promulgated, has been most faithfully preserved by the Church down to the present day: like the Apostle of the Gentiles she still maintains that the marriage union entered upon by two Christians is indissoluble because subject to the command of "the Lord," and at the same time, she regards the union contracted by two non-Christians as not invested with the same indissolublity: should one of the non-believing consorts become a Christian, he or she may remarry if the other gives up the primitive contract.

Francis E. Gigot.

[11]Henry Alford, *The Greek Testament*, vol. ii, p. 525. 6th edit. Cambridge, 1871.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (III)

Joseph Turmel.

Repentance and Confession. Convinced that he is faithfully reproducing the teaching of Hermas, Clement proves by the authority of that venerable writer that sins committed after baptism are forgiven *once* to him who repents. After quoting from the *Pastor*, he says in the Stromata:[1] "God in his great mercy has vouchsafed in the case of those who, though in faith (after baptism), fall into any transgression, a second repentance...a repentance not to be repented of.... But continual and successive repentings of sins differ in nothing from the case of those who have not believed except only in their consciousness of sin....The frequent asking for forgiveness for those things in which we often transgress is the semblance of repentance, not repentance itself." And in the *Quis dives*.[2] "True repentance consists in no longer falling into the same sins...but to eradicate them completely from the soul. Drive out these sins, and God takes up His abode in thee."

Clement therefore teaches Christians that they have in repentance a means of washing away their sins, but they must remember that they cannot count on this privilege for more than once. He moreover points out the practical means they must make use of in order that their repentance may be sincere and efficacious. His first requisite is the renunciation of sin: "Thief, dost thou wish to get forgiveness? Steal no more. Adulterer, burn no more. Fornicator, live for the future in chastity...." Then passing to the question of inveterate habits, he says: "It is probably impossible all at once to eradicate inbred passions; but by God's power and human intercession, and the help of the brethren, and sincere repentance, and constant care, they are corrected."[3]

Among the means of spiritual improvement just quoted there is one to which Clement attaches special importance and on which he insists, viz.: the "help of the brethren." He says: "Thou who art proud, powerful, rich, shouldst place over thyself some *man of God* as a

[1] *Strom.* ii, 13.
[2] *Quis dives*, 39.
[3] *Quis dives*, 40.

director and guide. Reverence, though it be but one man; fear, though it be but one man. Accustom yourself to hear some one speaking freely to thee...when thou seest him angry, thou wilt fear, when he groans, thou wilt be pained....He will pass many sleepless nights for thee, interceding for thee with God....And for you he will pray, and thou wilt honor him as an angel of God....This is sincere repentance." Elsewhere he speaks of the true gnostic as one who "points out to men the way of improvement, being appointed to discipline men for this amendment."[4]

To increase the hopes of sincere penitents he narrates an instance of pardon for sin. It is the story of St. John and the brigand. The attention of the Apostle had been attracted to a certain young man whom he met in one of the cities of Asia, so that he got the bishop of the place to adopt him. The latter took the youth to his home, instructed him; and finally baptized him. Later on, however, the young man took to evil courses, and finally became chief of a band of brigands. St John, when informed of this, does not cease until he has found his lost sheep. Clement represents him as addressing the young man in these touching words: "Fear not; thou hast still hope of life. I will answer for thee to Christ.' Thereupon, continues Clement, the youth "embraced the old man with lamentations, being baptized a second time with tears. Then the Apostle assuring him on oath that he would find pardon with the Savior, fell on his knees in prayer and kissed his hand, as now purified by repentance, and brought him back to the Church. There he offered up many prayers, and strove with him in continual fastings, and subdued his mind by various exhortations; nor did he stop until he had restored him to the Church, presenting a great example of true repentance and a great token of spiritual recovery."[5]

In the first place it must be noted that we cannot establish from these texts "the power of the Keys." The "man of God" to whom Clement commends the sinner, has for his mission to stir him up to repentance, to uphold him in temptation, to strengthen his resolutions. Nothing is said concerning absolution given or withheld; he is spoken of not as a confessor, but as what would be now called a director of conscience. And in the story of the brigand the Apostle St. John restores the sinner to the Church when he judges that he has been purified by contrition. At first he had pledged himself that he would

[4] *Quis dives*, 41: *Strom.* vii, 1.
[5] *Quis dives*, 42.

"answer for him to Christ." But we are not told that he exercised the power of the Keys. Moreover, the man of God may indeed be a priest (as in this instance of the Apostle), but he need not be such.[6] Any Christian who is sufficiently advanced in perfection and worthy of the title of "gnostic" can be called on to direct and correct his brethren. Clement has said elsewhere that those who live according to the rules of perfection and the gnosis can be enrolled among the Apostles, and indeed that such men, even though not members of the official hierarchy, are true priests in the eyes of God.

On another point, however, the power of repentance to wash away sins committed after baptism—Clement's message is clear. According to him, any Christian who has lapsed into sin can find in repentance "a second baptism." Thus, when St. John considered that the brigand had been sufficiently purified in his tears, he restored him to the Church. It is in Clement that we first find this doctrine of the power of repentance. True, he claims to get it from Hermas; but he is mistaken. In reality, Hermas claims to be sticking to the old principle that a Christian who falls into sin must remain outside the Church, since repentance is of no avail except before baptism. And if he announces "repentance for once" to his sinning brethren, it is by exception and in virtue of a revelation from on high. For once only, God will receive guilty Christians if they repent. But this departure from the principle will not be renewed. In the *Pastor*, this is a privilege granted to the contemporaries of Hermas. Clement sees in it a general law applicable to every generation of Christians. This was a misinterpretation of the text, but it was widely adopted. After Clement, the Fathers admitted guilty Christians to repentance; but "for once only."[7]

Orders. Clement shows knowledge of our hierarchy of three degrees. He sees in it a reflection of the angelic hierarchies, an image of the world of the elect in which also he discerns three degrees of glory. He says in the *Stromata*: "In my opinion, the grades here in the Church, of bishops, priests, and deacons, are imitations of the angelic glory, and of that economy which, the Scriptures say, awaits those who follow in the footsteps of the Apostles." In the *Pædagogus* also we find mention of the three ecclesiastical orders. However, in several passages of the *Stromata* the episcopate is passed over in silence where we

[6] *Strom.* vi, 13.

[7] In the *Quis dives*, 42, Clement proves his thesis by appealing to Luke xv, 7; Osee vi, 13; Ezech. xviii, 23; Luc. v, 21; Luc. xi, 13.

should expect to see it mentioned, and only the two other grades are referred to. For instance: "In the Church the priests attend to the department which has improvement for its object: and the deacons to the ministerial. Also, when praising the gnostic, or perfect Christian: "He is worthy to be enrolled among the Apostles. Such an one is in reality a *priest* of the Church and a true minister (deacon) of the will of God...not as being ordained by men...but enrolled in the *presbyterate* because righteous. And although here upon earth he be not honored with the *chief seat*, he will sit down on the four-and-twenty thrones judging the people, as John says in the Apocalypse."[8] It must be granted that in the former of these two passages Clement is led by his subject to mention only two grades of the ministry. He had therefore a reason for leaving unmentioned the episcopal order, although a theologian of later times would no doubt have found a way of bringing in the bishops as well as the priests. However, this explanation does not hold good of the second text. Here the perfect Christian is spoken of as being worthy to belong to the ranks of the Apostles, worthy to be accounted among the priests, among those who are honored with the "chief seat." It is difficult to avoid the impression that the priests are the inheritors of the Apostles, and the holders of the "chief seat." To sum up: Clement is acquainted with the episcopal order, and yet seems to consider the presbyterate as the chief ecclesiastical dignity. The solution of this difficulty is probably to be found in the letter of St. Jerome to Evangelius when he says that during the second century and the first thirty years of the third, the episcopate at Alexandria was merely a commission granted by the clergy to one of their members by a majority vote.

Clerical Celibacy. At the end of Book II. of the *Stromata* Clement lays down, concerning the conduct of married people, rules which he seems to apply to himself: "Let *us* purge away from marriage every foul and polluting practice....Marriage must be kept pure as a sacred statue. *We* are to arise from our slumbers with the Lord, and retire to sleep with thanksgiving and prayer." These passages give some grounds for believing that their author was himself married—and Clement was a priest. Further on, in the course of a dissertation which aimed at establishing against the Gnostics the lawfulness of marriage, the author of the *Stromata* writes: "The apostle receives the man of one wife, whether he be priest, deacon, or laic, so long as

[8] *Strom.* vi, 13; viii, 1.

he uses his marriage lawfully." Here, it is evident, marriage is allowed to the priest and the deacon equally with the layman, on condition of proper use of it. The same teaching is found in another passage where we read: "What answer can be given to these texts (of St. Paul) by those who claim that marriage, though approved by the Mosaic Law, is no longer tolerated under the new Covenant? What answer can be given by those who hold in horror the act of cohibition and generation? Moreover, the apostle puts at the head of the Church the bishop who rules well his household—by which expression he indicates marriage."[9]

[9] *Strom.* ii, 23; iii, 12; iii, 18; cf. Funk Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen i, 146.

NOTES.

Some months ago we hazarded the statement that "the storm-center of the Catholic intellectual movement is shifting rapidly from France to Italy." At that time the word "storm" in the above phrase seemed somewhat too strong to describe the situation, but even then there were floating straws which indicated a rising wind—the decision about the Pentateuch, the condemnation of *Il Santo*, the Pope's letter on Italian seminaries, etc. And certain events chronicled in our last issue—the suspension of Abbate Murri, the condemnation of *Il Rinnovamento*, and the Pope's address to the new Cardinals—point in the same direction. On account of the distance which separates us from the scene of strife, we must depend for information on the news purveyed by Roman correspondents to British and American journals. Here are a few selections which relate to the two men who seem to be most directly under fire, the Abbate Murri and Signor Fogazzaro.

The first is from *Rome*:—The two leading "liberal" Catholics of Italy just now are Don Murri and Senator Fogazzaro. Against the former the Holy Father himself has been obliged after waiting long and patiently to take very severe measures. The second has just inaugurated in Turin a series of "religious" lectures with one on "the biological origin of religious consciousness." The ecclesiastical authorities had previously made the following announcement: "To the Catholic Church alone belongs the instruction of her children in Christian dogma and morals. It is fitting, therefore, that priests, who should always be an example to the laity, abstain from attending any religious conference given independently of the ecclesiastical authority." Before the lecture Fogazzaro alluded thus to the opposition of the authorities: "The only opposition I anticipate to our enterprise is that of those who profess a negative dogmatism about the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, or who consider religious questions as unworthy of study. I am aware of these hostilities and I rejoice in them." These lectures have been founded with the proceeds of a book placed on the Index and they are to be managed by a Committee of Catholics whose Catholicity is swallowed up in their liberalism.

The correspondent of the *Tablet* puts it as follows: Great prominence has been given in the Liberal papers of Italy like the *Corriere della Sera* and the *Giornale d'Italia* to the inauguration this week at Turin of the scientifico-religious lectures instituted by Senator Fogazzaro. Before writing his book *Il Santo*, which has since been placed on the Index of prohibited books, the Senator determined to devote the profits of it to a foundation of lectures of this kind. The Cardinal Archbishop of Turin forbade any of his priests to attend the opening lecture, which was delivered by Piero Giacosa, and had for its subject "the biological origin of the religious consciousness." The treatment of the subject was about

as non-Catholic as could well be imagined, but Fogazzaro had already explained to the audience that he had no intention of binding his lectures down to Catholic teaching. It is very likely that the ecclesiastical authorities will either issue a general prohibition against Catholics attending these lectures, or will forbid them one by one as they are announced.

The correspondent of the *New World* sees things on a brighter side:— Signor Antonio Fogazzaro, the author of *Il Santo*, has received a letter from President Roosevelt, who, after complimenting him highly on his literary work, has given him a most cordial invitation to come to America. In a recent interview with the representative of the "Stampa," Signor Fogazzaro referred to this book, and its condemnation, saying that the measures taken by the ecclesiastical authorities had caused him the profoundest sorrow, but that he had done his duty by submitting to the Church, and his submission was both spontaneous and entire. It is to be hoped, indeed, that his submission was not merely a matter of form, though there have not been wanting signs, which make one fear he is not altogether sincere in his protestations. In the same interview he speaks with great sympathy of Don Romolo Murri, living in retirement with the shadow of Holy Church's condemnation on him, at the same time he bears witness to Don Murri's firm attachment to the Catholic faith, adding he is sure that Don Romolo will accept the Church's chastisement in the spirit of a good Catholic. We have heard the same said of Don Murri by a priest who was a college friend of his, "Don Romolo will never apostatize, he is at heart a good Catholic, and in his private life a most holy priest."

The condemnation of *Il Rinnovamento* naturally arouses some curiosity about the personality of its editors. Turning to the *Hibbert Journal* of January last we find in an article by M. Paul Sabatier the following warm, and probably flattering, appreciation of one of them—Tommasso Gallarati Scotti. "Scotti belongs to the most aristocratic circles in Milan, but he has had the good fortune of finding among the members of the clergy who had charge of his education a man of peerless mental and moral worth. The pupil has proven worthy of his master, and for the past ten years Scotti, who is now about twenty-eight, has not ceased to live his ideas with an ever increasing intensity and sincerity." Sabatier then tells how the young layman allied himself with the movement controlled by the Abbate Murri. It will be remembered that Signor Scotti presided last year at the meeting of the Christian Democrats which Don Murri was forbidden to attend.

Concerning the Holy Father's allocution in answer to the address of Cardinal Cavallari there are all sorts of speculations and prophecies from the unsoberly wise who know exactly what it means and what it portends. The newspaper writers who inform us periodically that such and such an English Catholic author is to be put on the Index (for no other reason that anyone can assign unless presumably that he can write an article on a modern topic in decent English) would have us believe that henceforth and forever no Catholic scholar, under the penalties of "The Jackdaw of Rheims," shall discuss any religious question from a modern point of view. Such views of the Holy Father's position are impertinences and absurdities.

Compare them with the statement of the recently appointed rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris, Mgr. Baudrillart (who is himself thoroughly up-to-date in knowledge and methods) that during his visit to Rome he found Pius X. anxious to see science and knowledge prosper among Catholics and to have modern heresies met with modern weapons. Of one thing we may feel sure, that Catholic writers who restrain their expositions, investigations and theories within the limits of Catholic dogma have nothing to fear from the benign and zealous Pontiff who occupies the See of Peter. It would be strange, indeed, if it were otherwise.

Before passing from Italy we wish to quote, if only for its admirable spirit, a recent utterance of a saintly old Italian prelate whom all the world reveres—Cardinal Capecelatro, Archbishop of Capua. "Biblical criticism," says the Cardinal, "is nothing new in the history of the Church. Sometimes more and sometimes less, it has always existed, and to realise this one has only to study St. Jerome and his time. But in our own days it has acquired a capital importance owing to the discovery of ancient manuscripts, to a deeper knowledge of Oriental languages, and above all to the new critical studies made by choice intellects with admirable patience and diligence." But, he goes on to say, this new study is full of danger, especially to untrained minds, and it would be well if only experts would attempt to handle it. "I would like to hope," he says, "that the Commission selected by the Pope for these studies will soon give us a suitable manual; and then perhaps we shall be able to use it in our Seminaries and see a little sure light among the different schools which, even in the ranks of Catholics, are contesting the field."

Then he turns in the kindliest way to the experts in the subject—"to whom, if they would permit me, I would like to say a word in a spirit of fatherly affection, gentleness and modesty: in a matter so intricate, arduous and delicate, let us always bow our minds and our hearts before the supreme authority of the Church and the Pope; let us remember that the present studies in biblical criticism have been made first by the rationalists, who have undertaken them with the prejudice that the supernatural does not and must not exist. Now we Catholics, even when we imitate them in their researches, in their deep knowledge of languages, and in sound criticism, must at all costs have the supernatural and love it ardently, because the supernatural is Christianity and for Christianity we should be ready to give our lives. Finally we should bear in mind that in our times there is a stronger fever for the new in all things, and we Catholics while we love what is new, love it as springing from, respecting, and perfecting what is old."

Concerning the relation of the Church in America to movements that are being stigmatized as dangerous, we cannot do better than to quote generously from a very thoughtful article by Rev. John A. Ryan, D. D., entitled "Is the modern spirit Anti-Religious?" in the Catholic World of May last. He takes for criticism the recent French edition of a work by A. M. Weiss, O. P., on *Le Péril Religieux.*

"To the Catholics of America the most interesting of the chapters is undoubtedly the one concerning modern neo-Catholicism, or liberal Cath-

olicism. Being a mental tendency and an attitude toward accepted principles, rather than a separate system of beliefs, liberal Catholicism can scarcely be defined so as to exclude all vagueness and all possibility of misinterpretation and misapplication. Thus, to say with Father Weiss that liberal Catholicism exaggerates the importance of modern science, and over estimates to state one of its distinguishing marks; yet the terms employed are such that the ultraconservative may utilize the description to stigmatize the moderate liberal whose views are entirely within the limits of the permissible and the orthodox. Liberal Catholicism must, to a large extent, be defined in terms of "too much" and "too little," and consequently may readily be misapplied by those who have an incorrect estimate of what constitutes "too much" and "too little." Those American Catholics who have been unjustly accused of "liberalism" will have no difficulty in appreciating this feature of the situation.

"Moreover, there is one clause of the author's definition which is so vague as to be almost inevitably misleading. It is the statement that liberal Catholicism believes in the essential goodness of man. Yet the Catholic who accepts the modern, or Jesuit, view of the essence and natural consequences of original sin, believes in a very real sense that man is essentially good. He holds that fallen man is as well equipped and as sound in natural faculties as man would have been in the state of pure nature. Hence he maintains that human nature, as now existing, is not corrupted from but corresponds essentially with, the natural or normal type of the *genus homo*. Surely it is not too much to say that this type is essentially good! On the other hand, to deny that man has any tendency to evil, or to say that his present state is not inferior to the state of original justice, is to incur a more severe censure than that of liberal Catholicism. Belief in the essential goodness of human nature is not among the specific qualities of liberal (in the bad sense) Catholicism; for within certain limits it is in accord with Catholic teaching.

"Another overstatement by the author is found in his characterization of the attitude of some Catholics toward biblical criticism. Certain portions of his language, in pages 298-301, would seem to imply that any variation from his historical interpretation of Old Testament problems, constitutes illicit concessionism and reprehensible liberalism. Not a few of the traditional positions, however, such as the claim that "David is the final editor of the Psalter, and Solomon the author of all the contents of the Book of Proverbs," have been abandoned by all Catholic biblical scholars. Other long-cherished exegetical traditions are no longer held by the more progressive and better equipped of the Catholic critics. Thus the old view of the Deluge, the rejection of which seems to Father Weiss to savor of liberal Catholicism, is not shared by his fellow Dominican, Father Lagrange (*Cf. Historical Criticism and the Old Testament,* pp. 133, 134).

"The defects noted in the last two paragraphs are slight in comparison with the value of his description of liberal Catholicism taken as a whole. The immense number of concrete illustrations that he gives are especially timely and helpful. Almost all of the "liberal" opinions which he cites

in Chapter VII. are out of harmony with the authoritative teaching of the Church. Some of the most prominent names quoted are: Doellinger, Mivart, Schell, Ronay, Ehrhard, Pichler, Loisy, Houtin, Scholz, Sepp, and Alaux. With the exception of Mivart, whose incursions into matters theological exercised very little influence, all these are Germans or Frenchmen. Father Weiss is in a better position than any American to know how far the errors and vagaries of these writers have affected the Catholic faith of Continental Europe. It is his opinion that they constitute a religious peril almost as great as the Reformation, or the scepticism of the eighteenth century.

"Happily this mass of "liberal" literature is very little known in America. Nothing corresponding to it is to be found in the utterances or writings of our recognized leaders, whether lay or clerical. It is true that Father Hecker is cited by the author as one of the minimizers of ecclesiastical authority; but the sentiment attributed to him is rather vague, and besides is quoted from the mischief-making book of Père Maignen. Father Weiss likewise refers to that "so-called Americanism" (le prétendu Américanisme," p. 310) which depreciated the "passive" Christian virtues; but his qualifying term takes about all the sting out of the reference. More important than either of these passages is his failure to characterize as "liberals" any of the prominent Catholics who represent or inspire the progressive (misnamed "liberal") party in the American Church. Thus we find no mention of the names of Ireland, Keane, Spalding, Lagrange, Prat, Hummelauer, Ward, Barry, or Gigot. It is a matter for congratulation, therefore, that liberal Catholicism, as concretely interpreted and illustrated by such a competent authority as Father Weiss, is unheard of in American Catholic literature. The so-called liberalism that is sometimes attributed to certain churchmen of America is evidently not regarded by the author as the genuine article.

"The author's contention that Christianity and the modern spirit are hopelessly antagonistic, contradicts, at least verbally, the theory of many American Catholics that the Church and the age are not of necessity mutually opposed. Father Weiss says that, "the dictum of Hartmann remains true, to wit, that the fundamental ideas of Christianity and those of the modern tendency are irreconcilable" (p. 381). Said Archbishop Ireland in his sermon at the celebration of the silver jubilee of Cardinal Gibbons in Baltimore, October 18, 1893: "I indicate the opportunity of the great and singular churchman... Men must be taught that the Church and the age are not hopelessly separated." In this sermon the Archbishop of St. Paul admitted that the modern age was guilty of many errors and extravagances, such as naturalism, excessive self-esteem, devotion to material things, love of innovation, and distrust of institutions that have come down from the distant past. All these, however, are accidentals, not the essentials of the age. In its depths it is "instinct with Christian emotions; it worships unwittingly at Christian shrines." It is witnessing a tremendous upheaval which is making for progress, for larger light and liberty. It is ambitious of knowledge, of political, civil, industrial and religious liberty. It desires to extend man's power over irrational creation. These conditions and aims constitute the essence of the modern

age, and they are all in themselves good. Toward the age as such, there is consequently no reason why the attitude of the Church should be unfriendly.

"The differences between this view and that of Father Weiss are partly of language, partly of appreciation, and partly of viewpoint. The Archbishop of St. Paul applies the terms "modern" and "the age" to what is good in our present time; the author of *Le Péril Religieux* restricts them to features that are evil. The latter would probably acknowledge that all the characteristics of the age lauded by the former are, in greater or less degree, deserving of commendation. In the second place, they very probably do not agree in their estimates of the proportion in which the good and evil stand to each other. Father Weiss undoubtedly attributes to the evil characteristics a greater, and to the good characteristics a lesser, importance than does Archbishop Ireland. Finally, the former most likely loves less and has less faith in the good features of the age, is less hopeful that they can be properly directed, and takes a darker view of the dangers to religion from the evil features. He is inclined to place emphasis upon condemnation rather than upon conciliation. In consequence of these differences, Archbishop Ireland and Father Weiss seem to be wide apart, whereas they agree as to principles, and on all matters of policy about which agreement is essential. Probably the majority of American Catholics, while admitting that Father Weiss is correct in his analysis and exposition of the evils that he deplores, would prefer the language, the estimate, and the viewpoint of the Archbishop of St. Paul."

Here is an interesting item from the Oxford correspondence of the *Tablet*: "Mr. Cyril Martindale, B. A., has crowned his career of academic triumphs by carrying off the Ellerton Theological Prize. It is curious to remember that the founder of this prize, who was a fellow of Magdalen almost during the whole term of Dr. Routh's long presidency, was, though a friend of Pusey in their earlier days, afterwards a most determined opponent of the neo-Catholic school in the Church of England... The excellent Mr. Ellerton, who suggested as a proper subject for his prize essay "The points on which we differ from the Romish Church," little anticipated that half a century after his death the prize would be awarded to a 'Romish' bachelor of the University, and a Jesuit at that." And so "the whirligig of time brings in his revenges."

It will, we feel, be not out of place, and possibly not without interest to our readers, if now and then we chronicle events which immediately concern the institution from which this Review proceeds, and the great metropolitan See from which it takes its name, and since it is the pleasant thing that everyone likes to put forward, it will be pardoned us if we mention a very kindly notice of our Seminary in the Roman *Rivista Storico-Critica delle Scienze Teologiche*, based on a perusal of our catalogue for the past year. The writer is most generous in his appreciation of the work which is being done here (and in other American Seminaries) for the formation of the students not only on intellectual lines, but also for the practical work of the ministry.

Our friend and contributor, Mgr. Batiffol, the eminent rector of the Catholic University of Toulouse, has paid a handsome compliment to the work of a brilliant young colleague of ours, Dr. F. X. Albert. The indefatigable author discovered that there was in existence an additional source of information on the subject not yet published—a Syriac manuscript containing a homily by Mar Qiore, a Nestorian of the sixth century, in the possession of Rev. Dr. Hyvernat of the Catholic University at Washington. In response to his inquiry. Dr. Hyvernat sent him a translation of the passage in question made by Dr. Albert. Mgr. Batiffol considered it of such importance that he has given it a prominent place in the March issue of his *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique*. Dr. Albert is at present engaged in translating and editing two Syriac treatises on the Fast, one by the same Mar Qiore, the other by Posi.

The Seminary has had the benefit of a course of lectures by the foremost Catholic authority on the question of Spiritism—Mr. J. Godfrey Raupert. While he was a clergyman of the Church of England, Mr. Raupert took a prominent part in the well-established scientific movement inaugurated in England for the study of occult phenomena. He has contributed very largely to the success of the movement by his carefully guarded investigations, and he takes a high rank among the scientists and philosophers who have devoted their energies to it; Mr. Alfred Russell Wallace. Sir Oliver Lodge, Prof. Sidgwick, William Crookes. F. W. Myers. Mr. Balfour. Andrew Lang, Prof. William James, Prof. Hyslop, etc. Since he became a Catholic he has lent himself to the needful task of preparing the minds of Catholics to deal with the questions which the new *scientific* Spiritism is bringing rapidly to the fore. At the request of the Church authorities, he has delivered numerous lectures on the subject in England and elsewhere. His book on "Modern Spiritism" is the best work of its kind, since the author possesses not only the accuracy of the scientist in estimating facts, but also the rarer philosophical power of arranging facts so as to reach conclusions. A smaller work on "The Dangers of Spiritism" has been in such demand that a new edition was recently issued. He is also the editor of a well-known collection of stories of conversion entitled "Roads to Rome."

In its relation to Catholicity, modern Spiritism presents two distinct aspects. On the one hand, it is a death-blow to materialism. Even the thorough-going materialistic writer on criminology, Cesare Lombroso, recently admitted that his experience with "psychical research" forced him to a belief in intelligences working outside the body. On the other hand, many of its votaries reach conclusions which are not in harmony with Catholic faith. Just at present Sir Oliver Lodge is engaged in what he calls a "reconstruction of Christianity" on the basis of Spiritism. From a Catholic point of view, the questions have been handled by Dr. Lapponi, who was for years the Papal physician. A theological treatise on it has been written in English by Dr. Lepicier, professor of theology at the Propaganda, under the title "The Unseen World." For the statement of facts in his book, Father Lepicer has drawn on the work of Mr. Raupert. The Roman authorities, ever alive to danger to the faith, have asked Mr. Raupert to give lectures wherever possible in his present tour, on the relations between the new facts and orthodox religious belief.

Those who are able to appreciate the element of truth in the modern apologetic for Catholicity will recognize the fitness of our chronicling a movement towards Catholic musical culture. New York Catholics have given their patronage during the Winter to two events of this kind; the Oratorio "St. Peter," conducted by the composer, Father von Hartmann, O. S. F.; and "The Redemption," rendered by the Catholic Dramatic Oratorio Society. The latter society is a permanent organization for the reproduction of musical compositions which reflect the Catholic ideal. All who are interested in the growth of Catholic culture will re-echo the words of Rev. Dr. Chambers in this connection:

"With due support of the public, at least that part of the public with a sense of the eternal fitness of things, which recognizes therefore as Catholic in music no less than in religion all that is true and sincere as applied to the life of Christ and His saints, we may hope for the permanent foundation of a society which will give, and in a manner unsurpassed if equalled in any part of the world, the many masterpieces of musical composition, which without the Church would not have been known even in the idea, and that though the composer himself be not of the household of the faith. No man, Catholic or Protestant, Gentile or Jew, in the sphere of religious art and music can be altogether free from the radiating influence of the universal Church, whose centre is at Rome, any more than he can escape the daily light and heat effects of the sun in the heavens above. The failure formally to acknowledge such dependence upon one as upon the other, or to be even conscious of it, is but an indirect recognition of the absolute necessity of both, quite as a matter of course; for to be deprived of them would mean extinction to the artisitc as to the physical being.

The following decree, relative to the authorship and content of the Fourth Gospel, was recently issued by the Pontifical Commission, *De Re Biblica*. Both the text and the translation are copied from the London *Tablet*:

THE BIBLICAL COMMISSION AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

To the proposed doubts that follow, the Pontifical Commission, *De Re Biblica*, has answered in the following manner:

Doubt I.—Whether from the constant, universal and solemn tradition of the Church coming down from the second century, as is gathered chiefly: (*a*) from the testimonies and allusions of the Holy Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, nay, even those of heretics, which since they must have been derived from the disciples or first successors of the Apostles, are joined by a necessary connection to the very origin of the book; (*b*) from the fact that the name of the author of the Fourth Gospel was received always and everywhere in the canon and catalogues of the Sacred Books; (*c*) from the most ancient manuscript codices of the same Books and their versions in various languages; (*d*) from the public liturgical use obtaining throughout the whole world from the very beginnings of the Church; leaving aside the theological argument, it is proved by such a solid historical argument that the Apostle John and no other must be acknowledged as the author of the Fourth Gospel, that the reasons to

the contrary brought forward by the critics in no wise weaken this tradition?

Answer.—Affirmatively.

Doubt II.—Whether also the internal reasons which are drawn from the text of the Fourth Gospel considered separately, from the testimony of the writer and the manifest kinship of the same Gospel with the First Epistle of the Apostle John, must be considered to confirm the tradition which unhesitatingly attributes the Fourth Gospel to the same Apostle? —And whether the difficulties which are drawn from the comparison of the same Gospel with the other three, having regard to the diversity of time, of scope, and of the hearers for whom or against whom the author wrote, can be reasonably solved, as the Holy Fathers and Catholic commentators have done at all times?

Propositis sequentibus dubiis Commissio Pontifica "de Re Biblica" sequenti modo respondit:

Dubium I.—Utrum ex constanti, universali ac solemni Ecclesiæ traditione iam a sæculo II decurrente, prout maxime eruitur: (*a*) ex SS. Patrum, scriptorum ecclesiasticorum, imo etiam hæreticorum, testimoniis et allusionibus, quæ, cum ab Apostolorum discipulis vel primis successoribus derivasse oportuerit, necessario nexu cum ipsa libri origine cohærent; (*b*) ex recepto semper et ubique nomine auctoris quarti Evangelii in canone et catalogis sacrorum Librorum; (*c*) ex eorumdem Librorum vetustissimis manuscriptis codicibus et in varia idiomata versionibus; (*d*) ex publico usu liturgico inde ab Ecclesiæ primordiis toto orbe obtinente: præscindendo ab argumento theologico, tam solido argumento historico demonstretur Ioannem Apostolum et non alium quarti Evangelii auctorem esse agnoscendum, ut rationes a criticis in oppositum adductæ hanc traditionem nullatenus infirment?

Resp.—Affirmative.

Dubium II.—Utrum etiam rationes internæ quæ eruuntur ex textu quarti Evangelii seiunctim considerato, ex scribentis testimonio et Evangelii ipsius cum I. Epistola Ioannis Apostoli manifesta cognatione, censendæ sint confirmare traditionem quæ eidem Apostolo quartum Evangelium indubitanter attribuit?—Et utrum difficultates quæ ex collatione ipsius Evangelii cum aliis tribus desumuntur, habita præ oculis diversitate temporis, scopi et auditorum pro quibus vel contra quos auctor scripsit solvi rationabiliter possint, prout SS. Patres et exegetæ catholici passim præstiterunt?

Resp.—Affirmative ad utramque partem.

Dubium III.—Utrum, non obstante praxi quæ a primis temporibus in universa Ecclesia constantissime viguit, arguendi ex quarto Evangelio tamquam ex documento proprie historico, considerata nihilominus indole peculiari eiusdem Evangelii, et intentione auctoris manifesta illustrandi et vindicandi Christi divinitatem ex ipsis factis et sermonibus Domini, dici possit facta narrata in quarto Evangelio esse totaliter vel ex parte conficta ad hoc ut sint allegoriæ vel symbola doctrinalia, sermones vero Domini non proprie et vere esse ipsius Domini sermones, sed compositiones theologicas scriptoris, licet in ore Domini positas?

Resp.—Negative.

Die autem 29 Maii ann. 1907, in Audientia ambobus Rmis Consultoribus ab Actis benigne concessa, Sanctissimus prædicta Responsa rata habuit ac publici iuris fieri mandavit.

Fulcranus Vigouroux, P. S. S.
Laurentius Janssens, O. S. B.
Consultores ab Actis.

Answer.—Affirmatively to both parts.

Doubt III.—Whether notwithstanding the practice which has constantly obtained in the whole Church from the first ages, of arguing from the Fourth Gospel as from a strictly historical document, and considering moreover the peculiar character of the same Gospel and the author's manifest intention of illustrating and vindicating the Divinity of Christ from the very deeds and words of Our Lord, it can be said that the facts narrated in the Fourth Gospel are wholly or in part made up to be allegories or doctrinal symbols, and that discourses of Our Lord are not properly and truly the discourses of Our Lord Himself, but the theological compositions of the writer, albeit they are placed in the mouth of Our Lord?

Answer.—Negatively.

Moreover, on the 29th day of May, 1907, in the audience graciously granted to both the Revs. Consultores ab Actis the Holy Father ratified the aforesaid answers and commanded that they should be made public.

Fulcranus Vigouroux, P. S. S.
Laurentius Janssens, O. S. B.

Consultores ab Actis.

Just before going to press we received a copy of the long promised Syllabus, which we are glad to publish *in extenso*, both Latin text and English translation being taken from the new magazine, *Rome*. Observations on this very important document are reserved for subsequent issues.

THE SYLLABUS.

DECREE OF THE HOLY ROMAN AND UNIVERSAL INQUISITION.

Wednesday, July 3, 1907.

With truly lamentable results our age, intolerant of all check in its investigations of the ultimate causes of things, not unfrequently follows what is new in such a way as to reject the legacy, as it were, of the human race and thus fall into the most grievous errors. These errors will be all the more pernicious when they affect sacred disciplines, the interpretation of the Sacred Scripture, the principal mysteries of the faith. It is to be greatly deplored that among Catholics also not a few writers are to be found who, crossing the boundaries fixed by the Fathers and by the Church herself, seek out, on the plea of higher intelligence and in the name of historical considerations, that progress of dogmas which is in reality the corruption of the same.

But lest errors of this kind, which are being daily spread among the faithful, should strike root in their minds and corrupt the purity of the faith, it has pleased His Holiness Pius X, by Divine Providence Pope, that the chief among them should be noted and condemned through the office of this Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition.

Wherefore after a most diligent investigation, and after having taken the opinion of the Reverend Consultors, the Most Eminent and Reverend Lords Cardinals, the General Inquisitors in matters of faith and morals, decided that the following propositions are to be condemned and proscribed, as they are, by this general Decree, condemned and proscribed:

1. The ecclesiastical law, which prescribes that books regarding the Divine Scriptures are subject to previous censorship, does not extend to critical scholars or students of the scientific exegesis of the Old and New Testament.

2. The Church's interpretation of the Sacred Books is not indeed to be condemned, but it is subject to the more accurate judgment and to the correction of the exegetes.

3. From the ecclesiastical judgments and censures passed against free and more scientific (cultiorem) exegesis, it may be gathered that the faith proposed by the Church contradicts history and that the Catholic dogmas cannot be reconciled with the true origins of the Christian religion.

4. The magisterium of the Church cannot, even through dogmatic definitions, determine the genuine sense of the Sacred Scriptures.

5. Since in the deposit of the faith only revealed truths are contained, under no respect does it appertain to the Church to pass judgment concerning the assertions of human sciences.

6. In defining truths the Church learning (*discens*) and the Church teaching (*docens*) collaborate in such a way that it only remains for the Church *docens* to sanction the opinions of the Church *discens*.

7. The Church, when it proscribes errors, cannot exact from the faithful any internal assent by which the judgments issued by it are embraced.

8. Those who treat as of no weight the condemnations passed by the Sacred Congregation of the Index or by the other Roman Congregations are free from all blame.

9. Those who believe that God is really the author of the Sacred Scripture display excessive simplicity or ignorance.

10. The inspiration of the books of the Old Testament consists in the fact that the Israelite writers have handed down religious doctrines under a peculiar aspect, either little or not at all known to the Gentiles.

11. Divine inspiration is not to be so extended to the whole of Sacred Scriptures that it renders its parts, all and single, immune from all error.

12. The exegete, if he wishes to apply himself usefully to biblical studies, must first of all put aside all preconceived opinions concerning the supernatural origin of the Sacred Scripture, and interpret it not otherwise than other merely human documents.

13. The evangelists themselves and the Christians of the second and third generation arranged (digesserunt) artificially the evangelical parables, and in this way gave an explanation of the scanty fruit of the preaching of Christ among the Jews.

14. In a great many narrations the Evangelists reported not so much things that are true as things which even though false they judged to be more profitable for their readers.

15. The Gospels until the time the canon was defined and constituted

were increased by additions and corrections; hence in them there remained of the doctrine of Christ only a faint and uncertain trace.

16. The narrations of John are not properly history, but the mystical contemplation of the Gospel; the discourses contained in his Gospel are theological meditations, devoid of historical truth concerning the mystery of salvation.

17. The Fourth Gospel exaggerated miracles not only that the wonderful might stand out but also that they might become more suitable for signifying the work and the glory of the Word Incarnate.

18. John claims for himself the quality of a witness concerning Christ; but in reality he is only a distinguished witness of the Christian life, or of the life of Christ in the Church, at the close of the first century.

19. Heterodox exegetes have expressed the true sense of the Scriptures more faithfully than Catholic exegetes.

20. Revelation could be nothing but the consciousness acquired by man of his relation with God.

21. Revelation, constituting the object of Catholic faith, was not completed with the Apostles.

22. The dogmas which the Church gives out as revealed, are not truths which have fallen down from heaven, but are an interpretation of religious facts, which the human mind has acquired by laborious effort.

23. Opposition may and actually does exist between the facts which are narrated in Scripture and the dogmas of the Church which rest on them; so that the critic may reject as false facts which the Church holds as most certain.

24. The exegete is not to be blamed for constructing premises from which it follows that the dogmas are historically false or doubtful, provided he does not directly deny the dogmas themselves.

25. The assent of faith rests ultimately on a mass of probabilities.

26. The dogmas of faith are to be held only according to their practical sense, that is, as preceptive norms of conduct, but not as norms of believing.

27. The Divinity of Jesus Christ is not proved from the Gospels; but is a dogma which the Christian conscience has derived from the notion of the Messias.

28. Jesus, while He was exercising His Ministry, did not speak with the object of teaching that He was the Messias, nor did His miracles tend to prove this.

29. It is lawful to believe that the Christ of history is far inferior to the Christ who is the object of faith.

30. In all the evangelical texts the name *Son of God* is equivalent only to Messias, and does not at all signify that Christ is the true and natural Son of God.

31. The doctrine concerning Christ taught by Paul, John, the Councils of Nicea, Ephesus and Chalcedon, is not that which Jesus taught, but that which the Christian conscience conceived concerning Jesus.

32. It is not possible to reconcile the natural sense of the Gospel texts with the sense taught by our theologians concerning the conscience and the infallible knowledge of Jesus Christ.

33. It is evident to everybody who is not led by preconceived opinions that either Jesus professed an error concerning the immediate Messianic

coming, or that the greater part of His doctrine as contained in the Gospels is destitute of authenticity.

34. The critic cannot ascribe to Christ a knowledge circumscribed by no limits except on a hypothesis which cannot be historically conceived and which is repugnant to the moral sense, viz, that Christ as man had the knowledge of God and yet was unwilling to communicate the knowledge of a great many things to His disciples and to posterity.

35. Christ had not always the consciousness of His Messianic dignity.

36. The Resurrection of the Saviour is not properly a fact of the historical order, but a fact of merely supernatural order, neither demonstrated nor demonstrable, which the Christian conscience gradually derived from other facts.

37. Faith in the Resurrection of Christ was in the beginning not so much in the fact itself of the Resurrection, as in the immortal life of Christ with God.

38. The doctrine of the expiatory death of Christ is not Evangelical but Pauline.

39. The opinions concerning the origin of the sacraments with which the Fathers of Trent were imbued and which certainly influenced their dogmatic canons are very different from those which now rightly obtain among historians who examine into Christianity.

40. The sacraments had their origin in the fact that the Apostles and their successors, swayed and moved by circumstances and events, interpreted some idea or intention of Christ.

41. The sacraments are merely intended to bring before the mind of man the ever-beneficent presence of the Creator.

42. The Christian community imposed (induxit) the necessity of baptism, adopting it as a necessary rite, and adding to it the obligations of the Christian profession.

43. The practice of conferring baptism on infants was a disciplinary evolution, which became one of the causes why the sacrament was divided into two, viz: baptism and penance.

44. There is nothing to prove that the rite of the sacrament of confirmation was employed by the Apostles: but the formal distinction of the two sacraments, baptism and confirmation, does not belong to the history of primitive christianity.

45. Not everything which Paul narrates concerning the institution of the Eucharist (I Cor. xi, 23-25) is to be taken historically.

46. In the primitive Church the conception of the Christian sinner reconciled by the authority of the Church did not exist, but it was only very slowly that the Church accustomed itself to this conception. Nay, even after penance was recognized as an institution of the Church, it was not called a sacrament, for it would be held as an ignominious sacrament.

47. The words of the Lord: *Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye shall forgive they are forgiven them, and whose sins ye shall retain they are retained* (John xx, 22, 23) do not at all refer to the sacrament of peanance, whatever the Fathers of Trent may have been pleased to say.

48. James in his Epistle (vv 14 and 15) did not intend to promulgate a sacrament of Christ, but to commend a pious custom, and if in this custom he happens to distinguish (cernit) a means of grace, it is not in that rigorous manner in which it was received by the theologians who laid down the notion and the number of the sacraments.

49. The Christian supper gradually assuming the nature of a liturgical action, those who were wont to preside at the Supper acquired the sacerdotal character.

50. The elders who filled the office of watching over the gatherings of the faithful, were instituted by the Apostles as priests or bishops to provide for the necessary ordering (ordinationi) of the increasing communities, not properly for perpetuating the Apostolic mission and power.

51. It is not possible that matrimony could have become a sacrament of the new Law until later in the Church; for in order that matrimony should be held as a sacrament it was necessary that a full theological development (explicatio) of the doctrine of grace and the sacraments should first take place.

52. It was foreign to the mind of Christ to found a Church as a Society which was to last on the earth for a long course of centuries; nay, in the mind of Christ the Kingdom of Heaven together with the end of the world was about to come immediately.

53. The organic constitution of the Church is not immutable; but Christian society like human society is subject to perpetual evolution.

54. Dogmas, sacraments, hierarchy, both as regards the notion of them and the reality, are but interpretations and evolutions of the Christian intelligence which by external increments have increased and perfected the little germ latent in the Gospel.

55. Simon Peter never even suspected that the primacy in the Church was entrusted to him by Christ.

56. The Roman Church became the head of all the Churches not through the ordinance of Divine Providence but through merely political conditions.

57. The Church has shown herself to be hostile to the progress of natural and theological sciences.

58. Truth is not any more immutable than man himself, since it is evolved with him, in him, and through him.

59. Christ did not teach a determinate body of doctrine applicable to all times and to all men, but rather inaugurated a religious movement adapted or to be adapted for different times and places.

60. Christian doctrine in its origin was Judaic, but through successive evolutions became first Pauline, then Joannine, and finally Hellenic and universal.

61. It may be said without paradox that there is no chapter of Scripture, from the first of Genesis to the last of the Apocalypse, which contains a doctrine absolutely identical with that which the Church teaches on the same matter, and that therefore no chapter of Scripture has the same sense for the critic and for the theologian.

62. The chief articles of the Apostolic Symbol had not for the Christians of the first ages the same sense that they have for the Christians of our time.

63. The Church shows itself unequal to the task of efficaciously maintaining evangelical ethics, because it obstinately adheres to immutable doctrines which cannot be reconciled with modern progress.

64. The progress of science requires a remodelling (ut reformentur) of the conceptions of Christian doctrine concerning God, Creation, Revelation, the Person of the Incarnate Word, Redemption.

65. Modern Catholicism cannot be reconciled with true science unless it be transformed into a non-dogmatic Christianity, that is into a broad and liberal Protestantism.

And on the following Thursday, the fourth day of the same month and year, an accurate report of all this having been made to Our Most Holy Lord Pope Pius X, His Holiness approved and confirmed the Decree of the Most Eminent Fathers, and ordered that the propositions above enumerated, all and several, be held by all as condemned and proscribed.

PETER PALOMBELLI,
Notary of the H. R. U. I.

SACRAE ROMANAE ET UNIVERSALIS INQUISITIONIS.

DECRETUM.

Feria IV, die 3 *Iulii* 1907.

Lamentabili sane exitu aetas nostra freni impatiens in rerum summis rationibus indagandis ita nova non raro sequitur ut, dimissa humani generis quasi haereditate, in errores incidat gravissimos. Qui errores longe erunt perniciosiores, si de disciplinis agitur sacris, si de Sacra Scriptura interpretanda, si de fidei praecipuis mysteriis. Dolendum autem vehementer inveniri etiam inter catholicos non ita paucos scriptores qui, praetergressi fines a patribus ac ab ipsa Sancta Ecclesia statutos, altioris intelligentiae specie et historicae considerationis nomine, eum dogmatum progressum quaerunt qui, reipsa, eorum corruptela est.

Ne vero huius generis errores, qui quotidie inter fideles sparguntur, in eorum animis radices figant ac fidei sinceritatem corrumpant, placuit SSmo D. N. Pio divina providentia Pp. X ut per hoc Sacrae Romanae et Universalis Inquisitionis officium ii qui inter eos praecipui essent, notarentur et reprobarentur.

Quare, instituto diligentissimo examine, praehabitoque RR. DD. Consultorum voto, Emi ac Rmi Dni Cardinales, in rebus fidei et morum Inquisitores Generales, propositiones quae sequuntur reprobandas ac proscribendas esse iudicarunt, prouti hoc generali Decreto reprobantur ac proscribuntur:

1. Ecclesiastica lex quae praescribit subiicere praeviae censurae libros Divinas respicientes Scripturas, ad cultores critices aut exegeseos scientificae librorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti non extenditur.

2. Ecclesiae interpretatio Sacrorum Librorum non est quidem spernenda, subiacet tamen accuratiori exegetarum iudicio et correctioni.

3. Ex iudiciis et censuris ecclesiasticis contra liberam et cultiorem exegesim latis colligi potest fidem ab Ecclesia propositam contradicere historiae, et dogmata catholica cum verioribus christianae religionis originibus componi reipsa non posse.

4. Magisterium Ecclesiae ne per dogmaticas quidem definitiones genuinum Sacrarum Scripturarum sensum determinare potest.

5. Quum in deposito fidei veritates tantum revelatae contineantur, nullo sub respectu ad Ecclesiam pertinet iudicium ferre de assertionibus disciplinarum humanarum.

6. In definiendis veritatibus ita collaborant discens et docens Ecclesia, ut docenti Ecclesiae nihil supersit nisi communes discentis opinationes sancire.

7. Ecclesia, cum proscribit errores, nequit a fidelibus exigere ullum internum assensum, quo iudicia a se edita complectantur.

8. Ab omni culpa immunes existimandi sunt qui reprobationes a Sacra Congregatione Indicis aliisve Sacris Romanis Congregationibus latas nihili pendunt.

9. Nimiam simplicitatem aut ignorantiam prae se ferunt qui Deum credunt vere esse Scripturae Sacrae auctorem.

10. Inspiratio librorum Veteris Testamenti in eo constitit quod scriptores israelitae religiosas doctrinas sub peculiari quodam aspectu, gentibus parum noto aut ignoto, tradiderunt.

11. Inspiratio divina non ita ad totam Scripturam, Sacram extenditur, ut omnes et singulas eius partes ab omni errore praemuniat.

12. Exegeta, si velit utiliter studiis biblicis incumbere, in primis quamlibet praeconceptam opinionem de supernaturali origine Scripturae Sacrae seponere debet, eamque non aliter interpretari quam cetera documenta mere humana.

13. Parabolas evangelicas ipsimet Evangelistae ac christiani secundae et tertiae generationis artificiose digesserunt, atque ita rationem dederunt exigui fructus praedicationis Christi apud iudaeos.

14. In pluribus narrationibus non tam quae vera sunt Evangelistae retulerunt, quam quae lectoribus, etsi falsa, censuerunt magis proficua.

15. Evangelia usque ad definitum constitutumque canonem continuis additionibus et correctionibus aucta fuerunt; in ipsis proinde doctrinae Christi non remansit nisi tenue et incertum vestigium.

16. Narrationes Ioannis non sunt proprie historia, sed mystica Evangelii contemplatio; sermones, in eius evangelio contenti, sunt meditationes theologicae circa mysterium salutis historica veritate destitutae.

17. Quartum Evangelium miracula exaggeravit non tantum ut extraordinaria magis apparent, sed etiam ut aptiora fierent ad significandum opus et gloriam Verbi Incarnati.

18. Ioannes sibi vindicat quidem rationem testis de Christo; re tamen vera non est nisi eximius testis vitae christianae, seu vitae Christi in Ecclesia, exeunte primo saeculo.

19. Heterodoxi exegetae fidelius expresserunt sensum verum Scripturarum quam exegetae catholici.

20. Revelatio nihil aliud esse potuit quam acquisita ab homine suae ad Deum relationis conscientia.

21. Revelatio, obiectum fidei catholicae constituens, non fuit cum Apostolis completa.

22. Dogmata quae Ecclesia perhibet tamquam revelata, non sunt veritates e coelo delapsae, sed sunt interpretatio quaedam factorum religiosorum quam humana mens laborioso conatu sibi comparavit.

23. Existere potest et reipsa existit oppositio inter facta quae in Sacra Scriptura narrantur eisque innixa Ecclesiae dogmata; ita ut criticus tamquam falsa reiicere possit facta quae Ecclesia tamquam certissima credit.

24. Reprobandus non est exegeta qui praemissas adstruit, ex quibus sequitur dogmata historice falsa aut dubia esse, dummodo dogmata ipsa directe non neget.

25. Assensus fidei ultimo innititur in congerie probabilitatum.

26. Dogmata fidei retinenda sunt tantummodo iuxta sensum practicum, idest tanquam norma praeceptiva agendi, non vero tanquam norma credendi.

27. Divinitas Iesu Christi ex Evangeliis non probatur; sed est dogma quod conscientia christiana e notione Messiae deduxit.

28. Iesus, quum ministerium suum exercebat, non in eum finem loquebatur ut doceret se esse Messiam, neque eius miracula eo spectabant ut id demonstraret.

29. Concedere licet Christum quem exhibet historia, multo inferiorem esse Christo qui est obiectum fidei.

30. In omnibus textibus evangelicis nomen *Filius Dei* aequivalet tantum nomini *Messias*, minime vero significat Christum esse verum et naturalem Dei Filium.

31. Doctrina de Christo quam tradunt Paulus, Ioannes et Concilia Nicaenum, Ephesinum, Chalcedonense, non est ea quam Iesus docuit, sed quam de Iesu concepit conscientia christiana.

32. Conciliari nequit sensus naturalis textuum evangelicorum cum eo quod nostri theologi docent de conscientia et scientia infallibili Iesu Christi.

33. Evidens est cuique qui praeconceptis non ducitur opinionibus, Iesum aut errorem de proximo messianico adventu fuisse professum, aut maiorem partem ipsius doctrinae in Evangeliis Synopticis contentae authenticitate carere.

34. Criticus nequit asserere Christo scientiam nullo circumscriptam limite nisi facta hypothesi, quae historice haud concipi potest quaeque sensui morali repugnat, nempe Christum uti hominem habuisse scientiam Dei et nihilominus noluisse notitiam tot rerum communicare cum discipulis ac posteritate.

35. Christus non semper habuit conscientiam suae dignitatis messianicae.

36. Resurrectio Salvatoris non est proprie factum ordinis historici, sed factum ordinis mere supernaturalis nec demonstratum nec demonstrabile, quod conscientia christiana sensim ex aliis derivavit

37. Fides in resurrertionem Christi ab niitio fuit non tam de facto ipso resurrectionis, quam de vita Christi immortali apud Deum.

38. Doctrina de morte piaculari Christi non est evangelica sed tantum paulina.

39. Opiniones de origine sacramentorum, quibus Patres Tridentini imbuti erant quaeque in eorum canones dogmaticos procul dubio influxum habuerunt, longe distant ab iis quae nunc penes historicos rei christianae indagatores merito obtinent.

40. Sacramenta ortum habuerunt ex eo quod Apostoli eorumque successores ideam aliquam et intentionem Christi, suadentibus et moventibus circumstantiis et eventibus, interpretati sunt.

41. Sacramenta eo tantum spectant ut in mentem hominis revocent praesentiam Creatoris semper beneficam.

42. Communitas christiana necessitatem baptismi induxit, adoptans illum tamquam ritum necessarium, eique professionis christianae obligationes adnectens.

43. Usus conferendi baptismum infantibus evolutio fuit disciplinaris, quae una ex causis extitit ut sacramentum resolveretur in duo, in baptismum scilicet et poenitentiam.

44. Nihil probat ritum sacramenti confirmationis usurpatam fuisse ab Apostolis: formalis autem distinctio duorum sacramentorum, baptismi scilicet et confirmationis, haud spectat ad historiam christianismi primitivi.

45. Non omnia, quae narrat Paulus de institutione Eucharistiae (I. Cor. xi, 23-25), historice sunt sumenda.

46. Non adfuit in primitiva Ecclesia conceptus de christiano peccatore auctoritate Ecclesiae reconciliatio; sed Ecclesia nonnisi admodum lente huiusmodi conceptui assuevit. Imo etiam postquam poenitentia tanquam Ecclesiae institutio agnita fuit, non appellabatur sacramenti nomine, eo quod haberetur uti sacramentum probrosum.

47. Verba Domini: *Accipite Spiritum Sanctum; quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis, et quorum retinueritis, retenta sunt* (Io. xx. 22 et 23) minime referuntur ad sacramentum poenitentiae, quidquid Patribus Tridentinis asserere placuit.

48. Iacobus in sua epistola (vv. 14 et 15) non intendit promulgare aliquod sacramentum Christi, sed commendare pium aliquem morem, et si in hoc more forte

cernit medium aliquod gratiae, id non accipit eo rigore, quo acceperunt theologi qui notionem et numerum sacramentorum statuerunt.

49. Coena christiana paullatim indolem actionis liturgicae assumente, hi, qui Coenae praeesse consueverant, characterem sacerdotalem acquisiverunt.

50. Seniores qui in christianorum coetibus invigilandi munere fungebantur, instituti sunt ab Apostolis presbyteri aut episcopi ad providendum necessariae crescentium communitatum ordinationi, non proprie ad perpetuandam missionem et potestatem Apostolicam.

51. Matrimonium non potuit evadere sacramentum novae legis nisi serius in Ecclesia; siquidem ut matrimonium pro sacramento haberetur necesse erat ut praecederet plena doctrinae de gratia et sacramentis theologica explicatio.

52. Alienum fuit a mente Christi Ecclesiam constituere veluti societatem super terram per longam saeculorum seriem duraturam; quin imo in mente Christi regnum coeli una cum fine mundi iam iam adventurum erat.

53. Constitutio organica Ecclesiae non est immutabilis; sed societas christiana perpetuae evolutioni aeque ac societas humana est obnoxia.

54. Dogmata, sacramenta, hierarchia, tum quod ad notionem tum quod ad realitatem attinet, non sunt nisi intelligentiae christianae interpretationes evolutionesque quae exiguum germen in Evangelio latens externis incrementis auxerunt perfeceruntque.

55. Simon Petrus ne suspicatus quidem unquam est sibi a Christo demandatum esse primatum in Ecclesia.

56. Ecclesia Romana non ex divinae providentiae ordinatione, sed ex mere politicis conditionbus caput omnium Ecclesiarum effecta est.

57. Ecclesia sese praebet scientiarum naturalium et theologicarum progressibus infensam.

58. Veritas non est immutabilis plusquam ipse homo, quippe quae cum ipso, in ispo et per ipsum evolvitur.

59. Christus determinatum doctrinae corpus omnibus temporibus cunctisque hominibus applicabile non docuit, sed potius inchoavit motum quemdam religiosum diversis temporibus ac locis adaptatum vel adaptandum.

60. Doctrina christiana in suis exordiis fuit iudaica, sed facta est per successivas evolutiones primum paulina, tum ioannica, demum hellenica et universalis.

61. Dici potest absque paradoxo nullum Scripturae caput, a primo Genesis ad postremum Apocalypsis, continere doctrinam prorsus identicam illi quam super eadem re tradit Ecclesia, et idcirco nullum Scripturae caput habere eumdem sensum pro critico ac pro theologo.

62. Praecipui articuli Symboli Apostolici non eamdem pro christianis primorum temporum significationem habebant quam habent pro christianis nostri temporis.

63. Ecclesia sese praebet imparem ethicae evangelicae efficaciter tuendae, quia obstinate adhaeret immutabilibus doctrinis quae cum hodiernis progressibus componi nequeunt.

64. Progressus scientiarum postulat ut reformentur conceptus doctrinae christianae de Deo, de Creatione, de Revelatione, de Persona Verbi Incarnati, de Redemptione.

65. Catholicismus hodiernus cum vera scientia componi nequit nisi transformetur in quemdam christianismum non dogmaticum, id est in protestantismum latum et liberalem.

Sequenti vero feria V die 4 eiusdem mensis et anni, facta de his omnibus SSmo D. N. Pio Pp. X accurata relatione, Sanctitas Sua Decretum Emorum Patrum adprobavit et confirmavit, ac omnes et singulas supra recensitas propositiones ceu reprobatas ac proscriptas ab omnibus haberi mandavit.

Petrus Palombelli.
S. R. U. I. Notarius.

BOOK REVIEWS.

History of the Books of the New Testament—by E. JACQUIER. Authorized Translation from the French, by REV. J. DUGGAN. Vol. I. *Preliminary Questions; St. Paul and his Epistles.* pp. xiv-335. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. Benziger Bros. 1907. $2.00 *net.*

As this is the first volume of a collection entitled "*The International Catholic Library,*" it opens with an "Introduction" setting forth the leading objects of the new collection. "Its proximate object," we are told, "is to offer to English students and readers the best results of the labors of Catholic scholars of every country. A further object of the International Catholic Library is to facilitate, between workers in the various fields of ecclesiastical science, through the comparison of ideas and ideals, a better understanding, an *entente cordiale,* making for peace and union." These are manifestly praiseworthy objects, and there is no doubt that they will actually be realized by this new *Library* under the skilful guidance of its learned and irenic editor, Rev. Joseph Wilhelm, D. D., Ph. D.

The volume before us is fully worthy of forming the first instalment of the International Catholic Library. Its author, Dr. E. Jacquier, is one of the ablest professors of the Catholic Institute of Lyons (France), and all that he writes bears the mark of sound judgment and genuine scholarship. At its very appearance a few years ago, the French original of the present volume was favorably received by scholars at large, and the fact that it has now reached its sixth edition shows that the work has steadily increased in value in the eyes of the general public. The questions treated are handled with remarkable ability and by means of that truly conservative spirit which preserves a genuine respect for traditional positions while it utilizes the ascertained data of modern Biblical science, and which was praised by Pius X., in his letter to the late Bishop Le Camus, and has been anew commended by His Eminence Cardinal Merry del Val in his recent letter (Oct. 19, 1906,) to Canon A. Cellini. (Cfr. *Revue Biblique*, July, 1907, pp. 477, 478). The translator has done his work well and, as he informs us, has omitted nothing of any importance from the French original.

The first part of the volume is concerned with *Preliminary Questions* bearing on the Chronology and the Language of the New Testament. The principal dates admitted by the Rev. Author, are for the most part, those which recent critics have accepted, and their discussion is characterized by great moderation. The principal features of the New Testament Greek are also ably, although perhaps too briefly, pointed out.

The second part of the volume is taken up with a summary of St. Paul's Life, and with a historical and critical examination of the Epistles ascribed to the Great Apostle of the Gentiles. In treating of St. Paul's life, Father Jacquier sums up well what is known of the nationality and the characteristics of the Apostle, the influences literary and doctrinal which he experienced, together with the history of St. Paul before his great Epistle to the Thessalonians, and the manner of language he used in composing his Epistles. The rest of the work (pp. 67-335) deals with the Epistles themselves and in their probable chronological order. The treatment of the historical and critical questions connected with each Epistle is sober, well informed, perfectly orderly, and sufficiently complete. Here and there, however, one might have wished the learned Professor to enter more fully into details or be stronger in his criticism. All in all, the volume is a very creditable production, and every English student and reader will peruse it with pleasure and profit.

The volume is supplied with an excellent map of the Journeys of St. Paul. It is well, and, on the whole, correctly, printed. It is to be regretted that the translator has not seen his way to add to the French text an Index of Contents which would have greatly enhanced the usefulness of this valuable work.

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Canaan d'après l'exploration récente—par LE P. HUGUES VINCENT, des, Frères Prêcheurs, Paris, Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1907, in 8v. xii—495 pp.

Father Vincent's book is at once instructive, learned, comprehensive, accurate and, to a certain extent, even original. It is undoubtedly the most important book that has as yet appeared on the subject, and its appearance marks an epoch in the history of Canaanite, or Palestine, archeology. Even the most distinguished of our modern Palestinologists would not disdain to have their own names placed

on the title-page of this book in which an immense amount of archeological and historical material is diligently gathered, carefully sifted, and critically discussed; and it is safe to say that in no language we possess such an accurate and comprehensive manual of Canaanitish history and archeology. The distinguished author is professor of Biblical Archeology in the Dominican School of Biblical Studies in Jerusalem, and is well known for his many archeological and epigraphical contributions to the *Revue Biblique*, published by Father Lagrange, of the same school.

The history of the various archeological explorations and discoveries made in Palestine, or, as our author prefers to call it, Canaan, by English, German, Austrian, French, Russian and American scholars and societies during the last half-century, but especially since the year 1890, is well-known to the public by the various publications, reports of proceedings and quarterly statements of the *Palestine Exploration Fund*, of the *Zeitschrift des deutsche Palestina Vereins*, of the *Mitteilungen und Nachrichten des deut. Palestina Vereins*, of the *Revue Biblique*, and more popularly by Dr. Benzinger in Prof. Hilprecht's *Explorations in Bible Lands During the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 579-622, and by Dr. F. I. Bliss in his recent book on the *Development of Palestine Exploration* (N. Y., 1906). Strange to say, however, the results so far obtained from these various explorations, important as they are, do not in any way compare in importance and magnitude with those obtained in Assyria, Babylonia, Elam and Egypt. The case, of course, could not have been otherwise as the towering and gigantic civilizations of the two great nations of the Nile and of the Tigris-Euphrates valley were far more advanced than that of any period of Canaanitish history. The civilization of Canaan, so far as archeological evidence shows, is marked by neither grandeur or originality; it is distinctly Babylonian in origin and character; for although geographically Canaan stands closer to Egypt than to Babylonia, nevertheless the civilization of the latter seems to have had a far deeper influence on Canaan than that of the former. Here, in fact, we find Babylonian rule and influence already well established as early as the third and fourth millenniums B. C.

The comparatively mediocre results thus far obtained in the field of Canaanite archeology do not, however, in the least minimize their importance and value for the reconstruction of ancient Canaanitish history, archeology, religion, art and civilization, as Father Vincent's elaborate book clearly shows. The principal merit of his

work consists in grouping together and co-ordinating for the purpose of history the innumerable independent results thus far obtained, and scattered in various scientific publications, books and reviews.

The book opens with an introductory chapter (pp. 1-22), in which the author passes in review the various archeological explorations made at Tell-el-Hesy, Tell Zakariyya, Tell-es-Safy, Tell Djedeidah, Sandahannah, Tell Gezer, Taannak and Tell-el-Mutesellim,, by Petrie, Bliss, Schumacher, Sellin, Macalister and others. Thence the author proceeds to discuss in seven lengthy chapters the following topics: Ch. I, (pp. 23-89), "The Ancient Cities of Canaan," in which a clever attempt is made to reconstruct and locate their geographical position, fortifications, structure, fortresses, houses, public and private edifices, from the earliest period of Semitic occupation down to Israelitish times. Principal among these cities are, of course, pre-Israelitish Jerusalem, Gezer, Lachish, Megiddo, Maresa and Ta'annak. In Ch. II, (pp. 90-151) the author discusses the various Canaanite centres of worship, the sanctuaries, high places, and especially the famous sanctuary of Gezer. The chapter is of capital interest, as in it the author successfully discusses the very origins of Semitic and Canaanitish religion and religious architecture, with special reference to those of the other Semitic nations of Western Asia. In Ch. III, (pp. 152-204) he discusses the cult and worship of the ancient Canaanites, their gods, superstititions and religious practices and ceremonies which have been so vividly illustrated by the recent excavations at Gezer, Megiddo and Ta'annak. In Ch. IV (pp. 205-296) a most interesting discussion is devoted to the study of the ancient Canaanitish dead, and dead-worship, sepulture, funeral rites, tombs and offerings to the dead, in pre-Irsaelitish times. Here the biblical data play a very important part, especially in connection with the so-called Hebrew belief in a life after death and the dwelling-place of the departed. In Ch. V (pp. 297-360) a very original study is made of the history of Ceramic art in Canaan from the remotest ages down to the fifth century B. C., and a comparative study is instituted between the ceramic and decorative art of the Canaanites and that of the Hittites and the other peoples of Western Asia. In Ch. VI (pp. 361-426) the geology and prehistoric archeology of pre-Israelitish Palestine are diligently and exhaustively treated. The last and concluding chapter (pp. 427-469) is, according to our judgment, the most instructive, and, to the student of ancient Oriental history, the most important chapter of the whole volume. In it the

learned Dominican has gathered all the available materials and data, indigenous, Assyro-Babylonian, Egyptian and Biblical, for the reconstruction of the history of Canaan. The synthesis is magnificent, and the abundant details are cleverly interwoven. Never before has the history of ancient Canaan been more accurately reconstructed and more interestingly presented to both scholars and students. The historico-political evolution of the various ancient Canaanitish tribes, prior to the period of the Hebrew conquest, is penned with masterly strokes, forming thus a most valuable introduction to the study of Old Testament history. The cuneiform and Egyptian inscriptions are freely and most effectively utilized.

The beautiful volume, which does ample honor to both author and publisher, is provided with a full analytical index, and accompanied with 310 illustrations. Needless to say, the work does credit to Catholic scholarship, to the Dominican order as well as to the faculty of the Biblical school of Jerusalem, and it forms a most worthy companion volume to Father Lagrange's "Etudes sur les religions sémitiques," and to Father Dhorme's "Choix de textes Religieux Assyro-Babyloniens." May their work and example inspire other young Catholic students to pursue with the same diligence, patience, ardor, scientific accuracy and open mindedness this very important field of Palestinian archeology. Let there be no more doubt cast upon the interest which Catholic scholars and exegetes take in the oriental and archeological study of the Bible. The names of scholars like Scheil, Lagrange, Vincent, Dhorme, Lammens, Ronzevalle and others, who have established themselves in Syria and Palestine for the promotion of Biblico-Oriental studies, are a sufficient guarantee of what enlightened Catholic scholarship can accomplish.

GABRIEL OUSSANI.

"Choix de textes religieux Assryo-Babyloniens, Transcription, Traduction, Commentaire,"—par LE P. PAUL DHORME, des Frères Prêcheurs; 8o. pp. xxxvii-406, Paris, Victor Lecoffre, 1907.

Father Dhorme is a young Dominican Assyriologist, disciple of Fathers Scheil and Lagrange, and professor of Assyriology in the Dominican Biblical School of Jerusalem. His two articles on "Le séjour des morts chez les Babyloniens et les Hébreux," and on the "Thirteenth Chapter of I Samuel," appeared in the *Revue Biblique* January and April 1907 respectively, and gave us hope to expect from

this rising Assyriologist valuable contributions to Assyriological and Biblical studies. Our hope was quickly and substantially realized when we received the above volume. We were gratified to see the erudition and solid learning of the author, for throughout the whole work the painstaking industry and genuine scholarship, which we have been accustomed to find in the various publications of the Biblical School of Jerusalem, are here at their best.

Our readers are well aware of the importance which Assyro-Babylonian researches and discoveries have assumed in the last half-century in the critical study of the Bible. More than once we have emphasized in THE NEW YORK REVIEW the importance of these studies, showing how these Assyriological researches are no longer the exclusive property of a few experts and specialists; how, on the contrary, they have become the common property of all cultured laymen and clergymen. Even our weekly magazines and daily newspapers are constantly announcing and popularizing these wonderful discoveries and researches, and it is a satisfaction to be able to state here that our Catholic scholars have not been altogether indifferent and inactive in this vast field of study, as the names of men like the late François Lenormant, Poignon, Brunengo, S. J.; Vigouroux, S. S.; Kaulen, Strassmayer, S. J.; Delattre, S. J.; Scheil, O. P.; Sauveplane, Pannier, Sandaljan, Loisy, Abbé de Moore, Lagrange, O. P.; Legendre, Martin, Baumgarten, Mari, Fossey and Thureau-Dangin sufficiently show.

Father Dhorme's book is one of the best Catholic contributions to Assyriological studies. The subject of the book is of the highest and most practical importance for the critical and comparative study of the early chapters of Genesis in the light of the legendary and mythological literature of Assyria and Babylonia. The aim of the author has been to give the transliteration and translation of the most important Assyro-Babylonian religious texts and poems, the study of which sheds more or less light on the Old Testament. Among these are the seven tablets of the Chaldean legend of creation and other cosmogonical poems, the Babylonian legend of the deluge, the myths of Adapa and Etana, the wonderful epic of Gilgamesh, which occupies fully 150 pages, the descent of Ishtar to Hades, and other religious texts, hymns, psalms and prayers which throw much light on the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament, especially the book of Psalms. Both the transliteration and translation of these texts, printed in parallel pages, are accompanied by

hundreds of historical, archeological and philological notes and discussions which form the principal merit of the volume, as all the texts published therein had been previously edited, translated and studied by scholars like Delitzsch, Haupt, Jensen, Jastrow, King, Zimmern, Jeremias, Gunkel, Loisy, Winckler and others. The work is preceeded by a very learned introduction (pp. ix-xxxvii), in which the author discusses the origin, date, composition, value and literary features of the texts in question together with a summary essay on the religion, pantheon and escathology, cult and worship of the ancient Babylonians, referring each of his statements to its relative text in the body of the volume.

The book is admirably printed, the matter well selected and carefully classified, and the whole critically studied, discussed and commented upon. We have but two remarks to offer, viz: First, those texts and passages which have close literary, historical and religious relations with the biblical account of creation, the garden of Eden, the creation of mankind, the deluge, etc., etc., should have been more fully commented upon, and their striking affinity and relationship more abundantly discussed and illustrated, especially for the benefit of young Catholic students who have no sure guide on the subject, as most of our popular Catholic contributions to the subject are either antiquated or, for some reason or another, to be used with caution. The other remark is that our Author should have been less sparing in materially increasing his collection of texts by adding many more Babylonian religious hymns, penitential psalms, prayers, incantations and magical formulas, as these throw an immense light on the Literature of the Old Testament. The poem, which our author aptly calls "Le juste souffrant," (pp. 372-379) should have been more carefully discussed, especially in the light which it throws on the book of Job, as has been recently suggested by Dr. Jastrow's remarkable study on the subject. (See *American Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xxv, 1906, pp. 135-191, and the *Contemporary Review*, Dec. 1906, pp. 801-808).

These remarks do not in the least detract from the great value of the book which should be read and studied by all Biblical students. We sincerely hope that Father Dhorme's scholarship and activity, so well represented in this first literary production of his, is but the signal and the beginning of a great and successful scientific career.

Gabriel Oussani.

Figures de Martyrs, par HENRI CHEROT, S. J.

Anything that touches on the French religious crisis, however, remote its bearing, ought to interest not only Catholics, but likewise all students of the history of religious and political experiences. The volume before us is of this trend. It consists of three sections: (1) A posthumous edition of one of the last works of the regretted Père Henri Chérot entitled "The Sixteen Blessed Carmelites of Compiègne." (2) "Some Martyrs of the Faith at the time of the Revolution," i. e., short stories from original documents on the heroic sufferings and deaths of numerous victims during the Revolution. (3) Three Blessed Martyrs of Hungary (A. D. 1619), an article written on the occasion of the recent beatification of these Hungarian Jesuits.

The first is by all means the most important because of the time and labor spent by the author during his long search in the archives of the Carmelites in Compiègne. Here we see evidence of work done at first hand and of recourse to sources hitherto mostly unexplored. One of the special advantages of this study is the fact that the author does not write history according to his own subjective impressions with personal colorings, and incidentally, occasional prejudices, but he simply transcribes the contents of original documents carefully gathered together from authentic sources, diligently compared and rigorously verified. The treatment is brief and succinct, following the succession of the historic facts and there is a tendency to restrict the number of traditional data by a careful and critical pruning. At first the author gives a brief history of the Carmel and the Carmelites of Compiègne under the ancient regime. This is followed by an exposition of their bitter trials and sacrifices during the revolutionary storm, wherein are depicted the attitude of each one of the nuns towards the godless movement, their personal sanctity and lofty motives in bearing all for Christ and His Church. The arrest, imprisonment and sufferings of the religious complete the narrative.

As the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Montpellier remarks in a letter to the author, the story of the Carmelites of Compiègne palpitates with the loftiest sentiments and reads like the acts of the Martyrs of the second and third centuries. There is exactness and precision without dryness. The work abounds in details, discussions of various texts where differences of opinion, pretentious paraphrasing of the original or a heightened style, had caused confusion. The notes are very numerous and bibliographical references abundant whence results a greater security to the reader. A *fac-simile* of a special request of the Carmelites to the

administrators of Compiègne with the signatures of their family names is given as a sort of documentary frontispiece. The conclusion of the narrative is somewhat abrupt, viz. on the scene of the execution, where the holy virgin martyrs chant the litany of the Blessed Virgin "until the fatal knife silences the last voice;" but this rather hasty termination of the story is due to the untimely death of the accomplished author. The history of these daughters of St. Theresa is full of glowing interest from beginning to end. An impartial presentation of the diverse machinations of the leaders during the Reign of Terror against the religious of Compiègne seems like the unveiling, step by step, of a celebrated dramatic plot. P. Chérot's work will prove of no small benefit to students of French ecclesiastical history during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The introduction of the cause for Beatification of the sixteen Carmelites martyred during the last days of the Reign of Terror was undoubtedly the occasion for a large output of historical researches and publications relative to the victims of the Revolution. In this second study there is gathered together a choice selection of heroic types of martyrs whose spirit and example might well be emulated in the troublous times that have recently come upon France. A great many of these victims belonged to the archdiocese of Paris. Abbé Chérot succeeded in selecting from various writers just what was needed to make the sketch although brief, yet sufficiently exhaustive and exact. He first traces the history of Abbé Noel Pinot, one of the most admirable characters of the revolutionary period—a priest simple in faith, solid in piety and heroic in Christian fortitude. The description of the death of this holy martyr is thus given: "Clad in his priestly vestments and lifting up his eyes to heaven, he cried out as if in the act of offering up the adorable sacrifice of the altar, *introibo ad altare Dei*. The executioners answered *Vive la République*. The martyrdom of Abbé Jean-Baptiste Bottex is next taken up. Here is a type very different from the preceding. Bottex had been clerical deputy to the States General—a man of brains and courage. He had written to Pius VI: "We have fulfilled our duties in the midst of troubles and storms and we have not allowed fear to come near the sanctuary. We shall meet our destiny, whatever it may be, with that courage which religion inspires. . . . We shall embark on a noble career, viz., the way of adversity." An intruding juror-priest invaded his parish. Père Bottex was apprehended on a trumped up charge, and having refused to pronounce an oath couched in schismatical terms, he was actually

beaten to death. He had respected the sanctity of the oath; conscience would not permit him to swear to a formula of whose lawfulness he had serious doubts. For this he received the crown of martyrdom.

The life and labors of Marguerite Rutan, Sister of Charity, are then detailed. Her life's work had been given to succor afflicted humanity. A committee of surveillance ordered her arrest under the charge of "fanaticism." Now this word was constantly used by the revolutionists as a synonym for fidelity and attachment to the Catholic faith. Infidel officialdom wished to strike down the Christian heroine whose powerful example lent an attractiveness to religion and its work. The author of *Figures de Martyrs* refers his readers to the pages of M. l'abbé Coste for a complete and stirring account of this sublime and cruel drama.

The sixteen Carmelites of Compiègne had worthy rivals in the thirty-two religious of Boltene put to death at Orange, also in the execution of twenty-eight Sacramentines and four Ursulines. It would not be feasible to run through all these examples of heroic Christian endurance. Even the cold blooded spectators of these brutal massacres, intoxicated though they must have been by the poisonous influence of lawless agitators and implacable enemies of religion, were forced to exclaim: "Religion alone can inspire so much courage and security."

To complete the galaxy of martyrs the compiler introduces one of the most brilliant and attractive articles of the late Abbé Chérot written on the occasion of the recent beatifications of three Hungarian Jesuit martyrs. This has been augumented by certain materials collected during the lifetime of the author, but owing possibly to his sudden demise, left unpublished.

These studies are well worth the time and attention of all who are interested in the French religious question. To understand correctly the present day crisis, we must go back at least to the days of the great revolution. Abbé Chérot has succeeded in bringing to the front and grouping the most select exemplars of heroic self-sacrifice, sincere and earnest faith, and unflinching fortitude during those times of confusion, bloodshed and terror when men's souls were tried and so many were found wanting. He has given his co-religionists a book of meditations well suited to the present crucial period, when in the face of a rapidly advancing materialism, open profession of religious convictions and a firm adherence to our Christian heritage are perhaps more necessary than in the days of the martyrs.

JOHN J. MAHON.

Lamennais et Lamartine—par CHRISTIAN MARECHAL, agrégé de l'Université. Librarie Bloud et Cie. Paris, 1907.

We prefer to look upon the early years of the nineteenth century as a battle-ground of ideas rather than of weapons. The struggle to restore an ancient but worn-out order, and the reorganization of shattered forces, were indeed fought out with the sword; the real victory was won, however, not at Waterloo, but in liberty of thought which at times degenerated into licence, in the dawning consciousness of power which the people possessed and which could not be smothered, and in the realization of the great fact that lay activity was to be the mark of the coming age. The very clash brought forth great men—some vowed to restore religion to its rightful place, others devoted to the annihilation of the divine fire—all men of the new thought.

Our author, M. Christian Marechal, who is not a stranger in the historical field, has taken two representative men of the crucial period for the subjects of his study. The choice has been well made. For boldness of thought and feeling, for depth of bitterness and hatred, for insubordination of unchecked genius, few have rivalled Lamennais and Lamartine. A strange pair they seem to the cursory reader or student, but one who reads these pages so rich in reference and citation, will readily see that the great thinker's will was dominant in every phase of the poet's life, and that this influence was not haphazard and indirect, but steady constant and formative. It is not too much to say with M. Marechal that "the social, political, philosophical and religious thought of Lamartine, from the beginning of 1817, was the precise reflex of that of Lamennais." In this influence over the poet, Lamennais obtained a vehicle of dissemination for his own thoughts and a sympathetic audience for his ideas which, despite his own magnificent flights, he could not always command.

In the volume before us, M. Marechal rapidly but with telling detail, sketches the sentimental, impulsive, susceptible, melancholy youth of Lamartine, from his earliest days, through his Italian experiences, when he travelled about with the *Emile* and *Nouvelle Héloise* in his pocket, back to Paris "worn out with anxiety, weeping and praying" to his conversion and consequent fall. In 1818, Lamartine, who at the moment was in the slough of despond, read the *Essai sur l' Indifférence*. The result was magical. His submission to the yoke of "the very young Abbé" was instantaneous and complete. From this time we can trace the new influence without the slightest

difficulty. As our author puts it, the *Méditations*, the *Harmonies*, the *Politique Rational*, the *Voyage en Orient*, *Jocelyn*, and *La Chute d' un Ange*, one by one were placed in "le cadre mennaisien."

The most interesting part of the book, and the most instructive as well for our times, is that which deals with the political influence exercised by Lamennais over Lamartine. M. Marechal very ably shows the transition of master and man from the monarchical basis to the platform of Christian liberalism. The famous *Hymne au Christ* concentrates in burning phrases the most cherished doctrines of the new school. The remaining chapters of these two intertwined lives, their relations with the *Avenir* and the final break with Rome bring the book to a close.

The author knows his matter well and has a clear method of presentation. His book is singularly free from bias and prejudice. It will give a fair insight into the character of these men and their relations to the stirring time in which they did their work.

W. F. Hughes.

Indulgences, Their Origin, Nature and Development—by Rev. Alexius M. Lepicier, O. S. M. New and enlarged edition. Benziger Bros., New York, etc.

In this goodly-sized volume of some 500 pages, Father Lépicier has brought together a great mass of information on the subject of Indulgences, a subject so much misunderstood outside of the Church, and often so ill understood by many within. The volume was first suggested to the Rev. Professor in his treatment of the topic in the course of his theological lectures in the College of the Propaganda, and the work first appeared in 1895. Its present form is much more than merely a new edition, many notes and other additions having been made to the original matter contained in it. An exhaustive treatment of the subject of Indulgences necessarily covers a vast amount of ground, since besides the historical account of their development in the Church and the different forms they have taken, such treatment must embrace the Catholic doctrine as to sin, penance, good works, and the Communion of Saints, all of which have an immediate bearing upon the subject. All this and much more is covered by Father Lépicier's volume, which seems to omit nothing, either historical or theological that has any important bearing on the matter

of which he treats. Since the appearance of his former edition Dr. Lea's well known work attacking the doctrine and practice in question has seen the light of day, and naturally comes in for a good deal of attention in this new edition, both in the notes and in the body of the work. Those who have read Lea's work, and perhaps been impressed by its wealth of quotations and general appearance of learning, would do well to go over the ground again, with Father Lépicier as their guide. His book, we feel sure, will be a valuable one, both for the theological student and for the general reader.

Catholic Scripture Manuals. The Gospel According to St. Luke. (Books I and II). With Introduction and Annotations—by Madame Cecilia, Religious of St. Andrew's Convent, Streatham, England. Benziger Bros. New York.

The work of producing a series of popular Scripture manuals for Catholics, to which this talented and prolific writer seems to have addressed herself, is one which will undoubtedly supply a need felt in many quarters. It is one, too, for which the writer seems well qualified. This present volume is evidently no hasty throwing together of odds and ends but the result of careful study and the consultation of the best sources of information, both Catholic and Protestant. There is an immense amount of information both in the annotations throughout the text and in the additional notes, which with the Introduction, take up between three and four hundred pages out of the more than eight hundred pages of the whole work. Nothing important seems to have been omitted which can serve to the elucidation of the sacred text, and the whole is arranged in exceedingly convenient form. These manuals are not intended for advanced students, but for those whom they have in view they should prove a valuable aid in the study of the Sacred Books. It is to be hoped Madame Cecilia will continue this work which she has so auspiciously begun.

Spiritual Conferences of St. Francis de Sales. Translated from the Annecy Text of 1895 under the supervision of Abbot Gasquet and the late Canon Mackey, O. S. B. Burns & Oates, London; Benziger Bros., New York, etc.

We have here a new translation of these well-known Conferences, forming another volume of the Library of St. Francis de Sales, to the

editing of which the late Dom Benedict Mackey had devoted the last years of his life. On his death the task of preparing this present volume for publication was taken up by Abbot Gasquet. The only previous English translation of these conferences was that of 1862, to which Cardinal Wiseman contributed a preface, which has also been prefixed to the present translation. The Conferences were given to the Religious of the Visitation at Annecy and have, of course, a special application to the Religious Life. But there is much in them which is applicable to any condition of life and, it is needless to say, they abound in that spirit of loveableness and sweetness so associated with the saintly Bishop of Geneva.

The Ascent of Mount Carmel, by St. John of the Cross. Translated by David Lewis. With Corrections and a Prefatory Essay in the Development of Mysticism in the Carmelite Order, by Benedict Zimmerman, O. C. D. London, Thomas Baker.

The present volume is not a new translation of this, one of the best known works of the famous Spanish mystic, but a reprint of a translation made in 1864, prefaced by an interesting essay by Father Benedict Zimmerman. The Carmelite Order is intimately associated with the development of Christian mysticism, and among its mystics none occupies a higher place than St. John of the Cross, if we except St. Teresa, with whom he was closely connected, and with whose writings it will be very natural to compare such a volume as the present. The works even of St. Teresa appeal to a comparatively small circle, but we should say that the readers of "The Ascent of Mount Carmel" would be likely to be even more restricted in number. St. Teresa treats of high themes and describes states of feeling and experiences which must ever be unfamiliar, save to the few, but in her writings we have continually such vivid glimpses of her own personality, and that a singularly interesting and attractive personality, as to place her writings entirely in a class by themselves, considered as treatises on mystical theology. Of all this, however, there is nothing in the works of St. John of the Cross, who deals with his subject in an impersonal and methodical manner. The "Ascent," of course, is the progress of the soul towards union with God, achieved through the mortification of the faculties, the active purification of the senses, the intellect and the will. It cannot be called easy reading but there are doubtless even in these days souls ready to follow the guidance

of St. John in the higher walks of the spiritual life to whom these pages will be welcome, and such a work as this will always be of strong interest to the student of mystical theology, not to mention its bearing on matters relating to psychical research so much mooted in these days.

S. P. Macpherson.

Les Idées de M. Loisy su le Quatrième Evangile.—Par Constantin Chauvin, Chanoine Honoraire, Supérieur du Petit Séminaire de Mayenne, Membre de la Commission des Etudes Bibliques. Paris, Gabriel Beauchesne & Cie., Editeurs.

It will doubtless be long ere we hear the last of the controversy stirred up in Catholic circles over the theories associated with the name of M. Loisy, and certainly, whatever may be thought of these, they are of far-reaching consequence enough to justify the deepest and most extended examination. M. Chauvin, in the present book limits himself to the consideration of Loisy's attitude on the Fourth Gospel, examining, to that end, the learned Abbé's commentary on that book, and the passages in his famous "Autour d'un petit livre" dealing with the same. M. Chauvin states, in his preface, that he will examine these works without "bitterness, passion or sarcasm," which gives us to understand that these regrettable features have characterized other examinations of M. Loisy's works, as, indeed is only too well known to have been the case. He states that he will "dissect every page, every phrase, every line" (and indeed he fulfills his contract) "praising what is to be praised, retaining what is to be retained, but also criticising and blaming what is to be blamed." We cannot, however, see that M. Chauvin has discovered anything to be praised, for the work is a root-and-branch condemnation of every important position advanced by M. Loisy on the matter in hand. At the same time, it must be said that the author's expressed purpose to write without bitterness, etc., is quite well carried out; if the condemnation is vigorous it is not angry or vindictive, neither is it mere swearing at large, but is based upon the thorough and searching examination of the text promised in the preface.

M. Loisy's theory as to the Fourth Gospel is well enough known. According to him, it is in no respect historical; it is a meditation upon the Gospel, a theological and mystical contemplation; St. John (or, rather, according to him, the unknown author of the Gospel) is not

the last of the historians of Jesus but the first and greatest of Christian mystics.

Now, the existence of an element in this Gospel—contemplative theological, mystical—not to be found in the other Gospels—has been recognized from the earliest times, as is evidenced by the title "spiritual Gospel" applied especially to it, by early writers, but to pass from that to a total denial of its historical character is a sufficiently bold leap, one in which M. Loisy has had at least no Catholic predecessors. He has had several, however, in the ranks of Protestant critics, and M. Chauvin points out the close, almost word-for-word resemblance between some of M. Loisy's statements and those of, for instance, M. Réville, the well-known French critic, remarking that it must surely be embarrassing for a Catholic writer to find himself so entirely at one with Rationalistic thought and so much at variance with the stream of Catholic tradition on this subject. It cannot be said, however, that M. Loisy exhibits any signs of such embarrassment.

M. Chauvin admits that it can, nay must, be allowed that the Fourth Gospel has preoccupations other than historical, that it has a purpose theological, even polemical, an "idée maitresse"—that of exhibiting and emphasizing the Divine Personality of the Founder of Christianity and His pre-incarnate life—all of which necessarily and naturally governed the mind of the author in his selection of materials. We are not left, either, to gather this as the result of our own examination of the Gospel; the author himself plainly avows it —"these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ. the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through His Name"—such is his own plain statement of the object of his work. All this, says M. Chauvin, can be allowed, as also that the incidents narrated—the miracles of healing, etc.—are symbolical in character, expressive of spiritual facts and truths, without any detriment whatever to the historical character of the Gospel. He points out that it is not only Catholic or even "orthodox" Protestant critics who have clearly discerned the unmistakable marks of historical narrative in the scenes depicted by St. John. Renan is positive on that side, seeing in the precise details of the narratives "des souvenirs de vieillard d'une prodigieuse fraicheur" and "un cachet historique indubitable."

On the whole, while it is true that our author occasionally minimizes the difficulties connected with the Fourth Gospel and its differences from the synoptics, he makes a good case for his contention

that Loisy has often exaggerated these. The latter for example represents the prodigies performed by the Christ of the Fourth Evangelist as invested with a character "astonishing" and "stupefying" in contrast to those related by the synoptics, but can such a distinction be maintained? The raising of Lazarus may be described as "stupefying," but is it more so than the bringing back to life of the daughter of Jairus of the widow's son of Naim, both related by the Synoptics? Or, if the miracle of Cana is "astonishing" is it more so than the multiplication of the loaves related by all the Evangelists? Granting the miraculous at all, it is a somewhat risky business to enter on questions of more or less. If Jesus is "un grand thaumaturge" in St. John, not less so is He in the three other Gospels. Again, to maintain, as Loisy does, that while the Christ of St. John preaches *Himself* incessantly, the Christ of the Synoptics preaches simply His "Kingdom," certainly seems an exaggeration. Examples numerous enough of this self-proclamation are found in the Synoptics, and, while we do hear more of the Kingdom in these and of the Person in the other, as M. Sabatier points out, "la première est substantiallement impliquée dans la seconde et repose toute sur elle."

M. Chauvin enters upon a detailed examination of the different passages of the Gospel given by M. Loisy as examples of religious allegory. He does not deny the allegorical character of some of them, without as already stated, seeing in that fact a necessary impeachment of their historicity. The allegorization of others he dismisses as arbitrary and fanciful, displaying rather "the ingenuity of the interpreter than the true thought of the sacred writer." It must be said, indeed, that as we read these strange and subtle interpretations, the question M. Chauvin asks from time to time—"comment M. Loisy sait-il cela?" rises involuntarily to our lips.

On questions of date and authorship, as would be expected, our author adheres to the traditional positions,and on these points advances nothing that is not already familiar to all who take an interest in this question.

If this book cannot be said to set at rest the difficulties connected with the Fourth Gospel, and if, indeed, in many respects it seems to pass rather lightly over them, we can at least thank M. Chauvin for a book calculated to be of real value in the consideration of these matters. He certainly fulfils what he sets out to do and while there is nothing of timidity or hesitation in his method, his book is

without trace of that "odium theologicum" so often imported into such discussions.

SAMUEL P. MACPHERSON.

Sin—by the REV. V. S. ECK, M. A. Longmans, Green and Co. 1907, pp. xii—240.

This volume belongs to the Oxford Library of Practical Theology which has for its object "to supply some carefully considered teaching on matters of Religion to that large body of devout laymen, who desire instruction but are not attracted by the learned treatises which appeal to the theologian." Its aim is "to translate the solid theological learning into the vernacular of everyday practical religion." The purpose of the present volume is "simply and solely the practical one helping men to face their sin, and to fight against it with hopefulness and courage." The author devotes the first part of his book to a treatment of Original and Actual Sin; the remainder deals with the Way of Recovery and includes chapters on Punishment, Forgiveness Penitence, Confession and Absolution. The dogmatic treatment of Sin lacks that clean cut clearness of our Catholic manuals. The author makes Original Sin consist in " the disorder of our nature brought into it by the first act of rebellion, and reinforced, it may be, by every subsequent act of rebellion, whereby we are inclined to consent to the lower instincts within us, or to allow the higher part of us to act in independence of the Creator. (p. 28) He evidently fails to grasp, for he refers to it quite incidentally, the real essence of Original Sin, namely, the disinheritance of mankind from the supernatural state and prerogatives; it is thus he is led to give undue prominence to what is only an effect of the Fall. He is more successful in his treatment of Actual Sin which he considers "as the act of a personal being in rebellion against the Personal Creator and Lawgiver." (p. 82). His discussion of the Sin unto Death, Deadly and Venial Sin, Eternal Sin (i.e. the sin against the Holy Ghost) and the Seven Deadly Sins is careful and well worth reading. But the author is most happy in his practical treatment of Sin, the Way of Recovery. These chapters form the best part of his book and make a good study especially of Forgiveness and Penitence There is an able summary of the history of Sacramental Confession in the Church though some will disagree with the author on these points: "whilst public confession before the whole Church was the normal thing, private confession to an in-

dividual presbyter was also used...either as a step to the public discipline or with a view to dispensing with it" (p. 178); again while the abolition of public confessors in constantinople about 390 forces us to admit the danger of scandal in public confession, the author gives no historical reason why after the Edict of Milan, "public confession gave rise to great danger of collision with the Civil courts" (p. 178); and few theologians will agree with his sweeping statement that "it is clear (from the writings of the Fathers) that it (the confession of sins to the Church, publicly or privately) was not regarded as necessary to the obtaining of pardon from God" (p. 180). It is hardly necessary to add that the author's view of public confession will be opposed quite strenuously by those who maintain that the confession of sins was always secret and that the Satisfaction and Reconciliation—from the second to the sixth centuries—alone were public. While we are agreed as to the author's statement of the necessity of a detailed acknowledgment of our sins to God, we are forced to part company with him when, as a representative of the Church of England, he strips the practice of confession of its compulsory character and makes it a mere voluntary act of the individual. It is difficult to see how he can hold this position in the face of his assertion in his chapter on Absolution that Christ delegated the power of Absolution to His Church. Would God have endowed His Church with such a wonderful power and not make its use necessary to salvation? The decision of Leo XIII on Anglican Orders compels us to dissent from the author when he declares that the Church of England enjoys the power of Absolution (p. 209), and it is startling to say the least to read that "it is not as God that our Lord claims this right (of Absolution) but as man," in his capacity as God's representative. (p. 194.).

It is evident that the book is at times incorrect doctrinally, and many will object to its historical treatment of Confession; yet the volume will be found very helpful in deepening our realisation of sin, in teaching us how to conduct our life long battle against it and in fitting us for the final triumph.

JOHN J. MITTY.